DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 850 HE 001 141

Study Abroad. The Study of Education at Stanford. Report to the University.
Stanford Univ., Calif.
Report No-R-9
Pub Date Dec 68
Note-81p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Descriptors-*Educational Objectives, Foreign Culture, Higher Education, *Organizational Change, Planning, *Program Improvement, Student Exchange Programs, *Study Abroad, *Undergraduate Study
Identifiers-*Stanford University

This report, the ninth in a series of ten, is presented by the Steering Committee, the Study of Education at Stanford. The series, based on the concept that education should be a continuous process of discovery throughout life, sets forth recommendations for strengthening the academic enterprise of Stanford University. In this report the Committee on Study Abroad, which considers the Stanford Overseas Campus Program to be the best arrangement of any US university for study abroad, concerns itself with the importance of overseas study to undergraduate education at Stanford. Part I contains the Committee's recommendation which center around 5 judgments about the future of the program and are designed to exploit the educational opportunity that the program represents. It is proposed that the program be freed from any connection with Stanford's undergraduate General Studies Program and that more flexible and diversified policies be followed at the overseas campuses. To this end the Committee recommends a separate committee for each overseas campus that would establish policies for that campus. Part 2 describes the Committee's work during 1967 and 1968. Part 3 discusses and presents recommendations for the 5 major overseas campuses: in Germany, France, Italy, Austria, and England. Part 4 deals with the 3 special language centers. Written requests for copies of this report may be sent to: Study of Education at Stanford, Room 107, Building 10A, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document]. (WM)

ED032850

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
ON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
ED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
TION OR POLICY.

dy Abroad

The Study of Education
at Stanford

Report to the
University

IX

HE 001 141

Contents

Preface 1

Introduction by the Steering Committee 3

Report of the Committee on Study Abroad

1. Introduction & Recommendations 5
2. What the Committee Did 12
3. The Five Major Overseas Campuses 16
4. The Three Special Language Programs 37

Appendices

1. Description of the Stanford Overseas Campus Program 40
2. Overseas Interviews: Report by Richard Bale 45
3. Faculty Questionnaire Findings 58
4. Student Questionnaire Findings 68
5. The Special Programs 72

Preface

This is one of a series of reports, which we submit to the University community for its consideration. The first of our reports, *The Study and Its Purposes* stated the general premises on which our recommendations turn. The remainder of this series, in the approximate order of issuance, includes the following:

II. *Undergraduate Education*
III. *University Residences and Campus Life*
IV. *Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid*
V. *Advising and Counseling*
VI. *The Extra-Curriculum*
VII. *Graduate Education*
VIII. *Teaching, Research, and the Faculty*
IX. *Study Abroad*
X. *Government of the University*

Comments on these reports, and requests for copies, should be addressed in writing to Study of Education at Stanford, Room 107, Building 10A, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305.

Steering Committee
The Study of Education at Stanford

December 1968

Steering Committee
The Study of Education at Stanford

Herbert L. Packer, *Chairman*
Professor of Law and Vice Provost

Norton T. Batkin III
Undergraduate student in Philosophy

James F. Gibbons
Professor of Electrical Engineering

Albert H. Hastorf
Executive Head and Professor of Psychology

Joshua Lederberg
Executive Head and Professor of Genetics

Mark Mancall
Associate Professor of History

Michael M. Menke
A.B. Princeton 1963
Graduate student in Physics

Anne G. Osborn
A.B. Stanford 1965
Graduate Student in Medicine

Leonard I. Schiff
Professor of Physics

Robert R. Hind
Staff Director, Study of Education at Stanford

Study Abroad

Report
of the
Steering Committee

Introduction

We endorse this report of the Committee on Study Abroad. The topic committee's recommendations are wholly consistent with other proposals of the Study of Education at Stanford, and we support them without reservation.

Our Report II, *Undergraduate Education*, states our general recommendations on undergraduate curricular policies and requirements. Those proposals are designed to expand and diversify the choices open to undergraduates. Among the most important is the recommendation that the current rigid and complex requirements of the General Studies Program be abandoned. The Overseas Campus Program is currently operated as an integral part of the General Studies Program. The topic committee recommends that the program be freed from any connection with the General Studies Program and that more flexible and diversified policies be followed at the overseas campuses. To achieve that goal, it proposes that a separate committee for each overseas campus should establish policies for that campus.

The committee's suggestions tie in closely with the observations and recommendations in our Report II, and in our other reports. In addition, we make the following recommendations to supplement those of the topic committee.

This report calls for an Overseas Campus Coordinating Committee composed of the chairmen of the various separate Campus Committees. We recommend that the Coordinating Committee include at least one at-large

member who is not on any of the Campus Committees, to assure that University-wide viewpoints are represented. We also suggest that the chairman of the Coordinating Committee be an at-large member.

We anticipate that the task of chairing the Coordinating Committee will be an especially demanding one. We propose, therefore, that the chairman be afforded some relief from his regular faculty duties to carry on this work. This proposal is in line with a general recommendation made in our Report X, *Government of the University*. We also urge that each Campus Committee be provided with sufficient travel funds to permit occasional visits to the campuses by one of the Committee's members.

Further, we support the topic committee's proposal that each Campus Committee should, whenever feasible, include a member of the related language department. We would be more specific on this point; each committee for a non-English-speaking campus should invariably include a member of the related language department. This will insure a close working relation between language training overseas and the work of the home campus departments.

Our final suggestion concerns the compensation paid to a department when one of its members teaches overseas. This is presently a flat sum that is often less than the salary paid to the faculty member serving abroad. We believe that departments should receive full compensation for releasing members for overseas service, so that they will be better able to pay for comparable replacements.

The members of the Committee on Study Abroad were:

Thomas Ehrlich, *Chairman*, Professor of Law
Mark U. Edwards, Jr., Undergraduate student in History
Ivo J. Lederer, Professor of History
David Levin, Professor of English
Rodney Levine, Graduate student in Medicine
Nathan Maccoby, Professor of Communication
Walter H. Sokel, Professor of German
Raymond E. Wolfinger, Associate Professor of Political Science
Richard Bale, Staff assistant, graduate student in Education.

We are grateful to them for the valuable contribution they have made.

1. Introduction & Recommendations

Report of the Committee on Study Abroad

We think that the Stanford Overseas Campus Program is the best arrangement for study abroad of any American university and that those responsible for administering the program deserve substantial credit for this achievement. There are areas where we think the program can and should be improved; this report concentrates on those areas. This focus should not, however, be taken as more than an expression of our views on how to make a good program better. The main premise of this report is the importance of overseas study to undergraduate education at Stanford; our proposals are designed to exploit the great educational opportunity that the program represents.

After an exhaustive analysis of overseas study during the past 12 months we have reached five interrelated judgments concerning the future of the program:

1. Policy direction should be the direct responsibility of faculty and students.

2. Substantially greater flexibility is needed in the program, both to meet students' diverse needs and to take full advantage of the various resources of the different overseas campuses.

3. To accomplish these goals, policy direction should be decentralized in a separate committee for each campus.

4. The same high academic standards found at the home campus should apply to the overseas campuses.

5. In view of the significance of study abroad at Stanford, the University should not place a premium on achieving the program's goals without cost to its budget or to participating students. The program justifies a stronger claim on University funds; its benefits also justify greater demands on students, both in prior preparation and in academic standards at the overseas campuses.

A list of our major recommendations follows; these recommendations are designed to further our five judgments and to realize the full educational benefits that overseas study can provide. Part 2 describes our work over the past year. Part 3 discusses the five major overseas campuses and our recommendations concerning them. Part 4 deals with the three special language centers.

Summary of Recommendations

The Five Major Overseas Campuses

1. POLICY DIRECTION. A separate committee for each overseas campus should establish policies for that campus.

a. Each Campus Committee should consist of three faculty members, appointed by the Committee on Committees of the Academic Senate, and two students. Program administrators should not be members of any Campus Committee.

b. Intercampus coordination should be provided by an Overseas Campus Coordinating Committee, composed of the chairmen of each Campus Committee.

c. The Campus Committees and the Coordinating Committee should have a small staff to assist them in implementing their decisions on academic policy. For administrative purposes, this staff should be headed by an Assistant Dean in the office of the proposed Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

d. Non-academic aspects of overseas study should be the responsibility of an administrative director, subject to the policy guidance of the Campus Committees and the Coordinating Committee. For administrative purposes, the director should report to the Provost.

2. FACULTY SELECTION. Each Campus Committee should select the faculty who will teach at its campus.

a. The primary criterion for selecting faculty should be ability to use an academic discipline to enhance the educational value of students' overseas experience. Normally this will involve a working knowledge of the relevant language and some specialized knowledge of the host country.

b. If qualified Stanford faculty members cannot be recruited for a particular overseas campus, other United States or foreign faculty should be considered.

c. Pay for teaching overseas should be equal for every quarter.

3. STUDENT SELECTION & ORIENTATION. The number of students in each group at an overseas campus and the criteria for selecting those students should be set by the committee for that campus in light of the particular program designed by the committee. Criteria should be revised as programs change.

a. Student selection for a particular campus should be on the basis of ability to profit academically from a stay at that campus, and not on the basis of grade point average.

b. Each Campus Committee should consider allowing graduate students, former students at the campus, advanced undergraduates, and foreign nationals to participate in the program at its campus.

c. Each Campus Committee should plan a student orientation program, in collaboration with the resident staff and those Stanford faculty who will be in residence during the students' stay.

4. CURRICULUM. Each Campus Committee should design the curriculum for its campus to make maximum use of the resources of the host country.

a. The Overseas Campus Program should not be connected with the General Studies Program. The goals of the Overseas Campus Program should be expanded to include specialized education, advanced study, and the encouragement of research by faculty and students.

b. Experimentation and variety in academic affairs among the campuses should be encouraged by the Campus Committees.

c. The same high academic standards found at the home campus should be applied in all courses taught at the overseas campuses.

d. The Campus Committees should look to the home campus language departments to bear primary responsibility for the language curricula.

e. Detailed curricular planning for each campus should include adequate orientation of Stanford faculty and liaison between them and veterans of the campus and its resident staff.

f. Stanford faculty teaching at each campus, and those who have taught there, should take significant responsibility for shaping the program at the campus.

g. Each faculty member who returns from an overseas campus should meet with the Campus Committee for a thorough canvass of strengths, deficiencies, and opportunities for improvement.

5. CAMPUS LOCATION. Each campus location should be chosen to maximize opportunities for using the host country's resources.

a. A decision to close an established campus or to change its site should be the responsibility of the relevant Campus Committee.

b. Decisions to establish campuses in additional countries and choices of specific sites should be the responsibility of the Overseas Campus Coordinating Committee.

6. NATIONAL DIRECTORS & INSTRUCTORS. Each Campus Committee should have the power to appoint and remove directors and instructors for its campus.

a. Campus directors should be given considerable autonomy, subject to the policy guidance of the Campus Committee.

b. The directors at each campus should report to their Campus Committee. On academic matters, they should deal with a staff member designated by the committee. On administrative matters, they should deal with the Administrative Director on questions delegated to him by the committee.

c. Language instructors should be chosen by the Campus Committee in consultation with the appropriate Stanford department.

d. Availability for residence on a campus should be a criterion for selection of national instructors.

e. National instructors should visit the home campus in order to become acquainted with American undergraduate educational practices.

f. National instructors should meet annually in Europe to discuss common problems.

7. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE FIVE MAJOR OVERSEAS CAMPUSES. The foregoing proposals are designed to develop maximum flexibility in overseas study arrangements, both to exploit opportunities peculiar to individual countries and to allow greater scope for innovation at each campus. With this theme in mind, and in view of the present organization and operation of the Overseas Campus Program, we make the following further recommendations:

a. Students destined for a continental campus should complete study of the basic grammar of the host country language prior to departure. This will usually involve at least one full year of language instruction at Stanford or a demonstration of equivalent competence before departure. Faculty members should normally meet the same standards.

b. The first four weeks of each group's stay at a continental campus should be devoted to intensive language instruction, with emphasis on speaking ability and use of newspapers and other popular materials. If the University continues on the quarter system, the remaining time abroad should be devoted to a single term of instruction. If the semester system is adopted, the fall semester should begin four weeks earlier and the spring semester should end four weeks later in order to accommodate the intensive language training.

c. Each Campus Committee should consider requiring substantive home campus courses as preparation for the overseas experience.

d. Each Campus Committee should consider devoting most or all of its program to one or two specific fields of study, e.g., art and art history at Florence.

e. When feasible, students should be allowed to live at a campus while enrolled at a nearby university; conversely, some students taking courses at a campus should be allowed to live off campus.

f. Campus Committees should experiment with allowing students to remain at a campus for more or less than six months, to return for second stays, and to conduct independent research using the campuses as bases.

g. No courses should be taught primarily by a "parade" of outside lecturers.

h. Except for language courses, no course should be required of all students.

i. Whenever possible, courses and field trips should be planned to supplement each other.

j. Academic and social regulations at the overseas campuses should not differ from those at the home campus unless there are compelling reasons for special rules.

The Three Special Language Programs

Policy direction for each of the three special language programs should be the responsibility of a Campus Committee, appointed and staffed as proposed in Recommendation 1, page 7. One faculty member and one student on each of these committees should be from *outside* the language department having primary interest in the program.

a. In general, collaboration between a special language program and a major overseas campus should be decided on a country-by-country basis. In particular, joint activities between the special students at Tours and the students at the overseas campus there should be encouraged.

b. When special students in fields other than the host country language would profit from participation in one of the special programs, this opportunity should be offered.

c. No commitments concerning the Spanish program at Salamanca should be made except on a temporary basis until the value of the program in its present location has been established.

2. What the Committee Did

The committee was formed in the fall of 1967 to investigate and report on all aspects of study abroad as it affects education at Stanford. At the outset of our work, we concluded that we could not tackle the basic issue, "Why study abroad?" until we had examined the actual impact of current overseas study arrangements on participating students and faculty. To this end, we gathered information from as many sources as possible on study abroad and its place at Stanford.

Although no effort was made to choose a "representative" committee, at least one member had visited all five major overseas campuses except Stanford in Germany for six months or more. A member of the committee, Professor Wolfinger, was in residence at the British campus in Grantham during the spring and summer quarters of 1968. The committee also pursued seven interrelated lines of activity: review of current operations; review of previous evaluative efforts; interviews and questionnaires; committee hearings; testing of students; review of relevant literature; and solicitation of responses to its interim reports.

1. *Review of Current Operations.* As a first step, we familiarized ourselves with the structure, scope, and financing of current study abroad operations at Stanford. We were aided in this task by Professor Robert A. Walker and Mrs. Hersche Allen of the Overseas Campus Office, Associate Provost Robert M. Rosenzweig, former director of the Center for Research in Inter-

national Studies, Mrs. Eleanor Lane of Graduate Overseas and Special Programs, departmental representatives of the special language programs, and many others.

2. *Review of Previous Evaluations.* The committee carefully reviewed the work of three previous committee studies of the Overseas Campus Program: *The Report of the Subcommittee on Government for the Overseas Campuses of the Committee on General Studies* (John Loftis, Chairman); *The Report of the Ad Hoc Committee of the [Student] Overseas Campus Board on Academic Affairs* (Steven Martindale, Chairman); and *The Report of the Humanities and Sciences Ad Hoc Committee on the Overseas Campuses* (Walter Sokel, Chairman). These reports and discussions with their authors were of substantial help in our work.

3. *Interviews and Questionnaires.* In order to ascertain attitudes on the overseas campuses held by faculty, students, and overseas staff, we did the following:

a. During December 1967 and January 1968 the committee staff assistant, Richard Bale, interviewed local directors and instructors, Stanford faculty, and about 100 students at the five campuses. Mr. Bale is a graduate student in educational psychology and is writing his doctoral dissertation on cross-cultural education. His report, *Research on the Overseas Campuses*, is summarized in Appendix 2.

b. In April 1968, all 71 faculty veterans of the Overseas Campus Program who were then on campus responded to a detailed questionnaire on a variety of issues concerning the nature, structure, and purposes of the program. The results appear in Appendix 3.

c. The committee analyzed a 1966 study of student attitudes on the overseas campuses, directed by Professor Maccoby.

d. The committee also reviewed a number of position papers prepared by faculty and students.

4. *Hearings.* Since October 1967 we have heard a full spectrum of views on study abroad from within and outside the Stanford community. We encour-

aged all interested students, whether or not they had been abroad, to state their opinions. Some spoke to the committee as a whole; many more discussed overseas study with individual committee members. All students who expressed an interest in the committee study were invited to submit written comments on the overseas program. The resulting papers were used in our work, and one of the responding students, Mark U. Edwards, Jr., subsequently became a committee member. Another student, Rodney Levine, is a member both of our committee and the SES Committee on International Education. A number of faculty members, both veterans and non-veterans of the program, also appeared before the committee. We met with the Provost and the Vice-Provosts for Academic Planning and Academic Operations, members of their staffs, and administrators of foreign study programs within and outside the University. Of particular value were two lengthy hearings with Professor Walker and several members of the Subcommittee on Overseas Campuses of the Committee on General Studies, and substantial supplementary material prepared by the Overseas Campuses Office. We thank Professor Walker and his staff for their cooperation.

5. *Testing of Students.* In order to assess the effects of two quarters in residence at the overseas campuses and the relative degree of preparation of participating students, we are planning "before and after" studies of five groups that were overseas in 1968. Tests covering language and knowledge of host countries were given to these groups before their departure and to control groups of students who did not go overseas. In addition, attitude questionnaires were given to those groups going abroad. An analysis of student attitudes appears in Appendix 4. Later this year, we hope to complete final testing of the returned students and so measure the effects of their study abroad. This information will be made available to those in charge of overseas study. None of the recommendations made in this report are contingent on the results of the final testing.

6. *Relevant Literature.* In addition to internal reports, we reviewed a wide body of literature relating to foreign study. Some of this literature and its relation to the Stanford Overseas Campus Program is discussed in a paper, *General Education in Branch Programs*, on file with the committee.

7. *Interim Reports.* During the course of our study we issued two interim reports, one in February 1968 and the second in June 1968. These reports

served not only to inform the Stanford community of our views at those times, but also to provide a focus for our own further work. We solicited comments on the interim reports, and in preparing this final report we considered those comments as well as the other material mentioned above.

*

Throughout our inquiry we have placed primary emphasis on the five general undergraduate campuses, as opposed to the three special language programs at Hamburg, Tours, and Salamanca. (Detailed descriptions of these special programs and the inter-university programs at Rome, Taipei, and Tokyo, and the Stanford-Warsaw exchange program are included in Appendix 5.) This is not because we consider the special programs unimportant. Quite the contrary, they are vital elements in the educational development of some Stanford students. At any one time, however, each of the five major overseas campuses involves substantially more students, faculty, and resources than all the special programs combined. For this reason, the major campuses are the principal focus of our attention. We emphasize, however, that our administrative proposals are directed to the three special language programs as well as to the five major overseas campus programs.

3. The Five Major Overseas Campuses

The Stanford Overseas Campus Program is not only the largest and most distinguished study abroad arrangement in the world, it is also a major element in undergraduate education at Stanford. About 55 percent of Stanford undergraduates now participate in the program; it accounts for one-sixth of those students' total time in college.

The program began in 1958 with a single location near Stuttgart. Campuses have since been acquired in France (1960), Italy (1960), Austria (1965), and England (1966). About 80 students go to each campus for a six-month stay. The faculty includes two members of the Stanford faculty, who usually also spend six months abroad, and two or more national instructors. Each campus is administered by two directors—one for administrative and one for academic matters—except in France, where both duties are shared by a director and an assistant director. The overseas campuses presently are part of the General Studies Program.

Professor Robert A. Walker is Director of the Overseas Campus Program and Director of the General Studies Program. Policy for these programs and oversight of their operations are the responsibility of the Committee on General Studies and its Subcommittee on Overseas Campuses, both of which are chaired by Professor Walker. Faculty for the overseas campuses are chosen by Professor Walker, in consultation with department heads and the Subcommittee on Overseas Campuses. (See Appendix 1 for a more detailed description of the history, policies, and structure of the Overseas Campus Program.)

The Purposes of Study Abroad

For many students a period abroad can be more rewarding than remaining at the home campus. We believe this is probably true for a substantial percentage of Stanford undergraduates; we are by no means certain, however, that it is true for a majority. The optimum character of study abroad and the stage at which it should occur vary widely among students. Some benefit most from a general overseas program; some gain more from a specialized curriculum; and a combination of general and intensive study is best for others. Whether a period abroad at a particular time will be a net gain depends on the educational resources available abroad and the extent to which a student is able to use them. We think our proposals will expand and diversify those resources–both at each campus and among campuses–and will enable students to exploit them more fully. What then can be expected from study abroad?

Study abroad can provide a degree of "cultural relativism," an opportunity for students to gain insights into the ways in which their culture differs from that of another country, and the extent to which the two cultures interact. By understanding a different way of life, students can broaden and deepen their understanding of their own culture as well. They can gain a knowledge of the common bonds between our own and another civilization–their historical continuities and divergencies.

These purposes of foreign study are not achieved merely by residence in a foreign country; otherwise we would not need overseas campuses. They are not met merely by contact with *any* natives; otherwise we could staff the campuses solely with cooks and maids. These goals are met only by engagement with the human, cultural, and physical resources of a foreign society *in the context of academic instruction*. "Engagement" means visiting libraries and museums, going to concerts and plays and pubs, arguments and bull sessions and desultory gossip, and research and specialized study. We deemphasize the familiar stress on "getting to know the people," not because this is unimportant, but because it is only part of the resources to be found abroad, and, for some students, not necessarily an essential part. An undergraduate who spends six months in Italy going to museums may be the richer for it than one who meets many Italians. A student in Germany who learns a great deal about a local evangelical sect may be better off than one who inspects every castle in the Rhine Valley. In this light, we make no categorical

statements about the ideal foreign experience. The particular character of success varies from country to country and from student to student.

We are concerned, however, by evidence that many students—as many as half of some groups—fall short of effective engagement with the host country and use the campuses as bases for frivolous tourism. We think that the curricular improvements we recommend, combined with higher academic standards and more realistic orientation, will discourage students without serious interests and will provide a more stimulating intellectual environment at each campus.

We realize that implementation of those improvements may reduce the numbers of students going to one or more campuses. This is true quite apart from our proposals for experiments at particular campuses. As we stated in our interim reports, however, we do not believe that there is anything magic in having 80 students per campus, a figure originally based on the number of students who would fill a transatlantic airplane. This was a necessary criterion in the last decade. It makes little sense in 1968. We appreciate that administrative planning is easier and expenses per student are less if the number of students at a campus is fixed and that each of the five current campuses was chosen with roughly 80 students in mind. Nevertheless, we believe that the improvements we propose are worth the costs.

Discussion of Recommendations

1. POLICY DIRECTION. A separate committee for each overseas campus should establish policies for that campus.

a. Each Campus Committee should consist of three faculty members, appointed by the Committee on Committees of the Academic Senate, and two students. Program administrators should not be members of any Campus Committee.

b. Intercampus coordination should be provided by an Overseas Campus Coordinating Committee, composed of the chairmen of each Campus Committee.

c. The Campus Committees and the Coordinating Committee should have a small staff to assist them in implementing their decisions on academic policy. For administrative purposes, this staff should be headed by an Assistant Dean in the office of the proposed Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

d. Non-academic aspects of overseas study should be the responsibility of an administrative director, subject to the policy guidance of the Campus Committees and the Coordinating Committee. For administrative purposes, the director should report to the Provost.

Separation of the academic and logistical, as proposed in these recommendations, reflects common University practice. Separation is also the mode of operation at four of the five overseas campuses, where responsibility is divided between directors of studies and directors of administration. We would never think that teaching and housekeeping should be in the same hands at the home campus; for the same reasons, they should be separated in the overseas campuses. This division will also increase faculty willingness to criticize logistical aspects of the program and, by diversifying effective control, will increase receptivity to innovation. The SES Committee on Government of the University also has expressed its judgment that the curricular and logistical aspects of the Overseas Campus Program should be divided.

Those aspects of the program that should be treated commonly among the five campuses are mostly in the realm of housekeeping and logistical support. We believe, therefore, that administrative responsibility for those aspects should be centralized in a single Administrative Director. These functions will be subject to less specific and continuing faculty scrutiny than academic matters. The proposed Dean of Undergraduate Studies' office is not an appropriate locale for such concerns; hence we recommend that the Administrative Director report to the Provost.

The key feature of our proposals—indeed, the most important recommendation in this report—is the creation of an individual committee for each campus. The case for this step is in considerable degree made throughout this report. As a practical matter, many of our other recommendations can be attained only with the separate Campus Committees we propose. This arrangement will not only increase faculty-student control of the campuses, but it will also enable each campus to exploit its own unique advantages and permit greater program flexibility and experimentation.

Each campus has resources that can best be used if academic policy is set by faculty and students who have an intimate familiarity with those resources and are undistracted by primary responsibility for the other campuses. The English campus, for example, can offer a more intensive curriculum and provide broader opportunities for research—ranging from study of documents to interviewing—because its students are freed of the need to learn a foreign language. The art treasures of Florence are also unique, as are the oppor-

tunities for study of a folk culture provided by the German campus. Exploitation of these resources is most likely on a campus-by-campus basis; and organization should follow policy needs.

One form of needed flexibility thus pertains to the special characteristics of each campus; another has to do with the ways in which campus programs are structured. At present, things are done very much the same way on all five campuses for two groups a year, year in and year out. (We realize that in the past year some changes have been made at particular campuses.) We made a variety of innovative proposals in our two interim reports; they have been endorsed by most who considered the reports. In general, those proposals were aimed at introducing greater flexibility in the overseas program through a series of different arrangements at the different campuses. We suggested, for example:

1. Sending one or more groups abroad for a year, rather than for six months. Perhaps the first half-year could be devoted to course work in a particular field and the second to independent study in that field.

2. Offering a small group of students, selected on an individual basis, the opportunity to work abroad on their own, using an overseas campus as a home base. Such students would spend considerable time mapping out their programs of research with their advisers in Palo Alto and would keep in periodic touch by mail while abroad.

3. Experimenting with different-sized groups of students and faculty members, including graduate teaching assistants, in the context of a program devoted entirely to tutorial work and independent study in one or several fields.

4. Allowing some students to live in the town where a campus is located, while participating fully in the academic work of the campus.

5. Inviting an exchange of students for residential and academic purposes at one of the campuses located near a major university.

These are examples of the kinds of experiments that we have in mind. None should be tried at all five campuses simultaneously, but each might be adopted for a period at one campus. Other ideas, such as varying the four-day

work week, should also be tried. We hold no brief for any particular experiment, only for the concept of pluralism in study abroad. We do not suggest that pluralism for its own sake is desirable, but that only by experimentation can we determine what kinds of overseas experiences best fit the needs of particular groups of undergraduates and the resources of the different campuses.

In principle, these and our other substantive proposals *could* be adopted on a campus-by-campus basis under the present system of centralized control. But this is not likely. Maximum diversity and exploitation of resources is most probable if policies for each campus are formulated by separate committees, each with an exclusive concern for a single campus. *Creation of those committees is essential to the future success of the overseas program.*

Since this is our most important single recommendation, we have discussed it at length with the administrators of the overseas campuses, with other University officials, and with interested faculty and students. A few, including Professor Walker, oppose the proposal on the ground that overseas-study responsibilities would be too diffused. Most of those with whom we talked, however, support our judgment that the costs of any diffuseness would be more than offset by gains in program flexibility, faculty-student responsibility, and academic quality. For example, Associate Provost Rosenzweig observed:

> We should take advantage of the fact that we now have five overseas campuses with ten separate groups of students each year to explore some of the possibilities of overseas study in a way that I believe has not been done and cannot be done under the current governing assumptions. We should use the opportunities which this program gives us to accumulate experience in a variety of approaches so that ten years from *now* we are not still arguing the wisdom of sending sophomores rather than juniors, of independent study rather than course work, of specialization rather than general education as if these were questions that are only answerable by contemplation of the ultimate essence of man's nature rather than by the processes of experimentation, data gathering, and accumulation of experience that are now commonplace in every discipline in the University.

From discussions with numerous faculty members and students we are confident that finding appropriate members for the Campus Committees will not be a problem. Members should be appointed for limited periods, although normally for longer than one year, and for overlapping terms.

We do not think that coordination among the campuses with respect to academic matters will be a serious problem under our proposal. We would

expect the proposed Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Studies for Study Abroad and the other staff of the Campus Committees to provide needed coherence. And when further coordination is necessary, as in faculty selection, it can be accomplished by the Overseas Campuses Coordinating Committee.

In short, we propose to reorganize the governing structure of the overseas campuses to conform to the organizational principles of the home campus: separation of academic and housekeeping functions; faculty primacy in academic matters; and substantive specialization.

2. FACULTY SELECTION. Each Campus Committee should select the faculty who will teach at its campus.

a. The primary criterion for selecting faculty should be ability to use an academic discipline to enhance the educational value of students' overseas experience. Normally this will involve a working knowledge of the relevant language and some specialized knowledge of the host country.

b. If qualified Stanford faculty members cannot be recruited for a particular overseas campus, other United States or foreign faculty should be considered.

c. Pay for teaching overseas should be equal for every quarter.

The virtues of these recommendations are, we believe, self-evident. Their importance may be judged by reference to our finding that only a third of the Stanford professors who have taught overseas expressed satisfaction with the faculty selection procedures.

We recognize that a tour at an overseas campus is an attractive fringe benefit to many Stanford professors, but we think it vital that this be a wholly incidental by-product of the program and not an important consideration in the selection process. We heard extensive testimony that too often in the past faculty members at the overseas campuses have had little interest in the cultures of the host countries and have used the opportunity to take a vacation with their families. Temptations to view overseas appointments as plums for deserving faculty will be minimized if the selection process is divorced from administration of the program, and faculty independence will be enhanced accordingly. Hence faculty selection must be done not just in consultation with faculty committees, but *by them*. Although some faculty members may be qualified to serve at more than one overseas campus,

separate Campus Committees will best withstand the temptation to treat the campuses as interchangeable for purposes of faculty selection.

The Overseas Campus Program has sometimes had difficulty finding Stanford faculty with adequate background. Our recommendations may reduce even further the number of qualified and available Stanford faculty. Hence our plan to recruit outside the University. Our proposals may also make it possible for the Campus Committees to consider selecting some faculty from the natural sciences and professional schools as well as the social sciences and the humanities.

Our suggestion on equal pay is based on the present practice of paying professors only 20 percent of their annual salary for teaching overseas during the summer quarter, although this quarter on the overseas campuses is no shorter than the other three. Vice-Provost Brooks has assured us that this policy will be changed; we urge that this be accomplished immediately.

3. STUDENT SELECTION & ORIENTATION. The number of students in each group at an overseas campus and the criteria for selecting those students should be set by the committee for that campus in light of the particular program designed by the committee. Criteria should be revised as programs change.

a. Student selection for a particular campus should be on the basis of ability to profit academically from a stay at that campus, and not on the basis of grade point average.

b. Each Campus Committee should consider allowing graduate students, former students at the campus, advanced undergraduates, and foreign nationals to participate in the program at its campus.

c. Each Campus Committee should plan a student orientation program, in collaboration with the resident staff and those Stanford faculty who will be in residence during the students' stay.

Here again, our theme is diversity; different programs and conditions may well call for different students and different orientation programs. Most overseas directors want greater diversity in the groups at their campuses. Many suggested including graduate students and undergraduates with previous experience.

We found no evidence that grade point average is a sound criterion for student selection; no overseas director interviewed believes that it is. (See Appendix 2, p. 47.) We recommend, therefore, that grade point averages be

ignored in selecting students with the exception of applicants for honors or independent work and those on academic probation. If the SES proposal to abolish grade point averages is adopted, this recommendation will, of course, be superfluous.

Students should have an opportunity to find out about the course offerings that will be available to them, particularly since they must arrange their course schedules and buy books before leaving Palo Alto. Orientation is an appropriate time to impress on students that academic standards will not be relaxed overseas—a particularly important point in that student expectations on this score may have an unfortunate influence on some faculty members. Only 37 percent of the Stanford faculty with overseas campus experience judged student orientation as excellent or good.

4. CURRICULUM. Each Campus Committee should design the curriculum for its campus to make maximum use of the resources of the host country.

a. The Overseas Campus Program should not be connected with the General Studies Program. The goals of the Overseas Campus Program should be expanded to include specialized education, advanced study, and the encouragement of research by faculty and students.

b. Experimentation and variety in academic affairs among the campuses should be encouraged by the Campus Committees.

c. The same high academic standards found at the home campus should be applied in all courses taught at the overseas campuses.

d. The Campus Committees should look to the home campus language departments to bear primary responsibility for the language curricula.

e. Detailed curricular planning for each campus should include adequate orientation of Stanford faculty and liaison between them and veterans of the campus and its resident staff.

f. Stanford faculty teaching at each campus, and those who have taught there, should take significant responsibility for shaping the program at the campus.

g. Each faculty member who returns from an overseas campus should meet with the Campus Committee for a thorough canvass of strengths, deficiencies, and opportunities for improvement.

We believe that a "general education" versus "specialization" dichotomy is particularly unsound in the context of study abroad; there is no need to choose between these two goals. The root of the problem is a confusion between "specialized" and "advanced." Students without prior preparation can take highly specialized courses, if those courses begin at the beginning. Freshman seminars are one demonstration of this point. Study abroad should be another. The goals of a liberal education are far more likely to be met by introducing students to some aspects of a foreign country in depth, rather than exposing them to *tours d'horizon*. Faculty members are specialists, not generalists; letting them teach what they know and are interested in will mobilize far more enthusiasm. Similarly, students are not equally interested in all aspects of a country's history and contemporary life. Requiring them to take survey courses that "cover everything" is a sure-fire recipe for resentment and boredom. All this is true on the home campus, as has been pointed out by SES Report II, *Undergraduate Education*. It is even more true at the overseas campuses, where unique resources offer prime opportunities for specialized study.

We not only think that specialization at the elementary level is the most useful approach to liberal education, we also believe that more advanced specialized work should be encouraged at the overseas campuses. Any ordinary group of students will include a fair number with background in many fields of study. An opportunity for them to do advanced work in seminars or directed reading need not militate against the interests of others. Beyond this, the overseas campuses should also be used for honors work, other advanced undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty research. Moreover, we support inclusion of selected host-country students in the programs of some campuses. The more heterogeneous student body resulting from such policies would enrich the experience of "ordinary" undergraduates.

We recognize that these more diverse uses of the campuses may displace some students, particularly in engineering. Like other University resources, however, the overseas campuses cannot provide all things to all students. In the abstract, none of us can weigh the relative claims to the Italian campus of, say, a history major doing an honors thesis on the Medici and a sophomore biology major. And we cannot judge categorically that the overseas campuses should serve only those students who have had the least—or the most—prior experience with their resources. In accordance with our belief in flexibility, decisions that will have the effect of expanding or reducing the campuses'

availability to different types of students should be made by their respective Campus Committees.

There are numerous specific ramifications of these general principles. To take just one example, instead of discouraging field research in the name of liberal education, the overseas campuses should encourage it. Interviewing in the local community enhances student-native contact for even the most inexperienced undergraduate. More advanced students gain invaluable experience in research techniques and the pertinent subject matter. Faculty have an opportunity, perhaps unavailable otherwise, to enrich their teaching and contribute to scholarly knowledge. Indeed, appointments to an overseas campus should not be considered a period of isolation from serious scholarship, but an opportunity for such scholarship.

In some cases a professor might find it valuable to be at a campus for more than the customary six months, to bring graduate students with him, and to make the campus his research headquarters. Such developments would be all to the good. They would, however, require changes in the facilities available to faculty; at present, only 28 percent consider the office facilities excellent or good.

Our observations about general versus special courses have relevance to the curricular approach suggested to Stanford faculty; they apply with greater weight to the "civilization" courses taught by resident national instructors. Most of these courses appear in need of revision; only 41 percent of the Stanford faculty judged them excellent or good. Students at the British campus, for example, must take four civilization courses covering the history of England from 1760 to the present. Because they are required, their instructors make them general in the hopes of offering something of interest to each of their involuntary pupils. The result is boredom on the part of both parties, lack of motivation, work, and learning by the students, and loss of a perfect opportunity to exploit the free time presented by the absence of language instruction. What might be is indicated by the enthusiasm and work displayed by the students who take the voluntary specialized seminar offered each quarter by one or the other of the British tutors.

Because of the reduced student motivation and faculty commitment that generally accompany required courses, the civilization courses should be diversified to give students a choice of one among several more specialized offerings. The result would be a good chance of learning something about one facet of the host country instead of nothing about all of it.

The civilization courses also need higher academic standards. In the

Austrian civilization course, for example, the only required reading was a guidebook published by the Austrian Tourist Office. The British civilization courses have lengthy lists of reserved books, but students are not generally required to buy books for these courses, and, perhaps for this reason, seldom do any reading for them except in a cursory way for term papers. Of the three-fifths of the Stanford faculty veterans expressing an opinion on the civilization courses, 53 percent thought them easier than comparable courses offered at home.

Moreover, 46 percent of the faculty veterans said that their own overseas courses were easier than their home offerings, and scarcely any said that their overseas courses were more difficult. When asked to judge the standards used by other Stanford faculty, 40 percent said they did not know, but most of the rest thought that more work was required at home.

In view of such findings, it is not surprising that students are almost unanimous in expecting grades to be higher and academic demands lower at the overseas campuses. Briefings by program officials and faculty veterans sometimes contribute to this impression and sometimes try to combat it, but it is clear to us that the expectation of an easy academic ride overseas is deeply embedded in the student culture and must be counteracted by staff and faculty.

In line with our emphasis on decentralized faculty control of the overseas campuses, we recommend that our language departments be more directly involved in planning the language curriculum on each campus. In part, this could be done by appointing, whenever feasible, a member of the appropriate language department to each Campus Committee.

Faculty planning to go overseas should exchange course lists, syllabi, and the like with campus veterans and resident staff. At present there seems to be little prior coordination. Less than a quarter of all faculty veterans reported that they integrated their courses with other offerings at their respective campuses.

Recommendations 4f. and 4g. are a call for greater faculty involvement in the foreign campus programs, both while overseas and on return. Stanford faculty should engage in continuing scrutiny and participation in all University programs. This is particularly important for the overseas campuses; they are far away and the involvement of most professors with them is intermittent at best. Few professors serve at any foreign campus. Among those who do, two factors militate against suggestions and complaints. First, some have the lame-duck psychology that reforms are too much trouble since their

experience will soon be over. Second, some who want to participate again in the Overseas Campus Program hesitate to make proposals for change in fear that as a result they will not be chosen. Both factors deprive the program of a potentially dynamic force for innovation. Participating faculty should accept greater responsibility for the program, and the Campus Committees should do what they can to make exercise of this responsibility easier.

5. CAMPUS LOCATION. Each campus location should be chosen to maximize opportunities for using the host country's resources.

a. A decision to close an established campus or to change its site should be the responsibility of the relevant Campus Committee.

b. Decisions to establish campuses in additional countries and choices of specific sites should be the responsibility of the Overseas Campus Coordinating Committee.

We recognize the virtues of various kinds of campus locations–metropolitan, urban, suburban, and rural–and think it unwise to make categorical pronouncements about the superiority of one kind over the others. This is a matter for case-by-case judgment.

Roughly speaking, a country's resources for overseas study are of two kinds: 1) its people and "folk culture"; and 2) cultural and intellectual facilities and major centers of economic, political, and social life. In some circumstances, engagement with the first type of resource may be more easily attained away from a big city. Yet the two site changes that have occurred were from rather remote rural districts (Semmering, Austria and Grantham, England) to the middle of a national metropolis (Vienna) and to a heavily populated, sophisticated suburb (Cliveden). In both cases, change was motivated not only by distance from cultural and intellectual resources, but also by the scarcity at Semmering and Grantham of local residents whom our students found both interesting and congenial. Living in a big city without much personal contact with the residents could be a valuable experience; a similar lack of contact in a village would be almost unendurable. Beutelsbach seems to be a better site than the original ones in Austria and England; it retains some rural character, but is also rapidly becoming a suburb of Stuttgart. This combination provides easy access to a cultural center and yet permits intimate contact with the local population.

We have considered at some length the desirability of having all the major

overseas campuses in Europe. There is a special historical relationship between Europe's culture and our own that can be better understood after a period in Europe. The cultures of Europe and the United States are not so dissimilar that comparison is difficult. Europe has a wealth of resources—libraries, museums, and much more. Finally, the physical problems of locating a campus and the logistical problems of moving students are (or at least have been until recently) a great deal easier for European than other foreign countries.

On the basis of these factors, the Overseas Campus Program has, to date, placed all the undergraduate foreign campuses in Europe. We do not criticize this policy, but we do believe that if future campuses are established, locations other than Europe should be carefully examined. The primary criterion should be whether the foreign location offers an opportunity for valuable educational experience that cannot be obtained at the home campus. Europe obviously has no monopoly on such opportunities. If the only choice were between a Stanford campus in Vienna and one in Dakar, probably most of us would choose Vienna. An experience in Senegal could be unique, but the rich connection of two cultures would be absent. At the same time, the question need not be framed in terms of either Europe or elsewhere. It may be that the practical problems of locating an undergraduate overseas campus outside Europe are extremely difficult, as those responsible for the Overseas Campus Program have said. But we believe that the potential advantages of a non-European location are sufficient to experiment with such a campus.

We have heard testimony both for and against the concept of "campuses" as opposed to student living arrangements with families, student residences, and so forth. In our view, a base of the sort provided at the five current campuses is not in itself necessarily good or bad; the critical factor is how that base is used. Within the context of our proposed curricular and other recommendations, we believe that the present campuses (except for Grantham) can offer support for a more intensive engagement by Stanford students in a foreign environment. Each should represent a focus of intellectual activity rather than, as is too often now the case, a residential sanctuary. At the same time, we again urge that limited numbers of students with adequate language and other background be permitted to make their own living arrangements on an experimental basis. Such arrangements could offer the opportunity for substantially more engagement than is now possible. They might point the way toward a thoroughgoing change in the residential arrangements of our study abroad program.

6. NATIONAL DIRECTORS & INSTRUCTORS. Each Campus Committee should have the power to appoint and remove directors and instructors for its campus.

a. Campus directors should be given considerable autonomy, subject to the policy guidance of the Campus Committee.

b. The directors at each campus should report to their Campus Committee. On academic matters, they should deal with a staff member designated by the committee. On administrative matters, they should deal with the Administrative Director on questions delegated to him by the committee.

c. Language instructors should be chosen by the Campus Committee in consultation with the appropriate Stanford department.

d. Availability for residence on a campus should be a criterion for selection of national instructors.

e. National instructors should visit the home campus in order to become acquainted with American undergraduate educational practices.

f. National instructors should meet annually in Europe to discuss common problems.

These recommendations express the themes of decentralization and faculty primacy. On the one hand, they will give greater scope to the responsibility and imagination of the various directors, and, incidentally, yield economies in avoidable staff travel and communications expenses. On the other hand, close policy and administrative supervision exercised by home campus program officials will be replaced by scrutiny by the Campus Committees and the resident Stanford faculty. This will help to implement the recommendation, which we endorse, of the Humanities and Sciences *Ad Hoc* Committee on Overseas Campuses that "the importance of the Overseas Campus Program in the fabric of education at Stanford should be recognized by enlarging the role of the faculty in the formulation and operation of the program."

We see no serious difficulties in having the Campus Committees appoint national instructors. Many Stanford professors have extensive connections in academic circles in each of the five host countries. And for campuses such as Stanford in Britain, where neither director is from the academic world, opportunities for discovering and assessing job candidates are greater at the home campus. Academic appointments customarily are made by canvassing likely senior faculty for suggestions, narrowing down the resulting list of

names, and making the final choice after personal interviews. The first two steps can be taken by the Campus Committees with the help of campus staff and appropriate departments. The interviews should be conducted at the overseas campus by a committee including but not limited to the two resident Stanford faculty.

The success of the two resident tutors at the English campus is the basis for Recommendation 6d. The advantages to students at Stanford in Britain of continuing, informal contact with the tutors are so great that we urge consideration of this pattern at the other campuses. This would mean, among other things, that national instructors should be young.

National instructors often seem to have expectations about Stanford students, based on educational traditions of their own countries, that are very different from those of the United States. These instructors should visit the home campus to become acquainted with American undergraduate education. In some cases, one leg of their travel might be accomplished without cost on the Stanford charter flights; the other could be financed out of the savings in staff travel costs resulting from more campus autonomy. The recommended annual European meeting of all instructors parallels the present meeting of directors. The purpose is to facilitate intercampus communication at this level.

The need for participation of the language departments in overseas campus language instruction dictates Recommendation 6c. In the past, virtually all communications between the home campus and the overseas language instructors have been channeled through the Overseas Campuses Office, and the home campus language departments have had little to do with the selection of local teachers. Communications between the departments and overseas language instructors should also be substantially expanded so that local teachers will become more fully aware of home campus methods and the needs of Stanford students, and home departments will place greater emphasis on the special needs of overseas students.

7. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE FIVE MAJOR OVERSEAS CAMPUSES. The foregoing proposals are designed to develop maximum flexibility in overseas study arrangements, both to exploit opportunities peculiar to individual countries and to allow greater scope for innovation at each campus. With this theme in mind, and in view of the present organization and operation of the Overseas Campus Program, we make the following further recommendations:

a. Students destined for a continental campus should complete study of the basic grammar of the host country language prior to departure. This will usually involve at least one full year of language instruction at Stanford or a demonstration of equivalent competence before departure. Faculty members should normally meet the same standards.

b. The first four weeks of each group's stay at a continental campus should be devoted to intensive language instruction, with emphasis on speaking ability and use of newspapers and other popular materials. If the University continues on the quarter system, the remaining time abroad should be devoted to a single term of instruction. If the semester system is adopted, the fall semester should begin four weeks earlier and the spring semester should end four weeks later in order to accommodate the intensive language training.

c. Each Campus Committee should consider requiring substantive home campus courses as preparation for the overseas experience.

d. Each Campus Committee should consider devoting most or all of its program to one or two specific fields of study, e.g., art and art history at Florence.

e. When feasible, students should be allowed to live at a campus while enrolled at a nearby university; conversely, some students taking courses at a campus should be allowed to live off campus.

f. Campus Committees should experiment with allowing students to remain at a campus for more or less than six months, to return for second stays, and to conduct independent research using the campuses as bases.

g. No courses should be taught primarily by a "parade" of outside lecturers.

h. Except for language courses, no course should be required of all students.

i. Whenever possible, courses and field trips should be planned to supplement each other.

j. Academic and social regulations at the overseas campuses should not differ from those at the home campus unless there are compelling reasons for special rules.

We are convinced that language facility is a *sine qua non* of significant cultural engagement at an overseas campus. The first two recommendations

are designed to improve students' ability to make use of their experience by being able to communicate adequately with natives and read newspapers and magazines. Not a single Stanford professor considered students' language preparation excellent, and only a quarter thought it was good. In line with our belief that the Overseas Campus Program is too important to be represented as "costless," we think that students should be–and will be–ready to devote more time and study to taking full advantage of the experience. Those students who are unwilling to treat their stay abroad as a serious intellectual experience are likely to be discouraged by the stiffer academic "admission fee."

Currently, Stanford students going to a foreign campus need have only two quarters of language training before leaving Palo Alto. In our judgment, this is often inadequate. Students should be required to complete the basic grammatical study in the language of the country to which they are going before departing, so that they will be capable of acquiring conversational ability quickly on arrival. Normally, this will mean a minimum of one full year (or its equivalent) of language study at Stanford.

We are also convinced that the language needs of students at a foreign campus are not necessarily the same as those of majors in language departments at Stanford. Less than 10 percent of Stanford students returning from an overseas campus took one course in the language of the country where they had studied; less than 3 percent took more than one. These figures indicate that few returning students have long-term interests in the language as a discipline. At the same time, all should have a substantial interest in learning to converse and read easily while they are abroad.

New programs in language instruction should also be tried for prospective overseas students. We suggest that intensive language training, possibly by native graduate assistants, might be provided either at one of the present campuses or in Palo Alto. On a trial basis, other arrangements, such as Berlitz training, might also be explored. At a minimum, such instruction should be given to those students who are chosen for overseas study although they do not have the minimum language training proposed above. We also suggest that more advanced instruction might be given other participating students by means of such intensive programs.

We recommend that the overseas campuses devote the first month of a six-month stay to such intensive language training without any other regular courses. Three or four hours a day of classroom language instruction plus substantial outside work would offer several advantages. First, it would

capitalize on high initial motivations of students on their arrival. It would encourage them to seek out foreign nationals, to read local newspapers, to go to local movies, and the like, in ways that the few hours per week of language instruction currently offered at the campuses do not provide. Second, it would tend to reduce the high incidence of student withdrawal from encounters with nationals because of inadequate speaking ability. Third, it would encourage—perhaps require—use of the foreign language inside the campus as well as out. Finally, it would allow Stanford professors, particularly those at a campus for the first time, a period in which to develop perspective on the relationship between the local environment and their own courses and an opportunity to improve their own facility with the language. This intensive instruction should emphasize conversational facility and use of newspapers and other popular materials.

Such an experiment at an overseas campus would probably necessitate structuring the five remaining months of regular courses in one semester, as opposed to the present two-quarter system. Courses would then extend through the length of students' stay at a campus, hopefully allowing deeper exploration of given topics. We urge that the merits of this semester plan—quite apart from facilitating language instruction—be considered by the Campus Committees even if the home campus remains on the quarter system.

Similar considerations support our views about prior substantive preparation; only 11 percent of the faculty veterans thought this preparation was good; 78 percent judged it fair or poor. We believe that the overseas curriculum should begin on the home campus and that, in general, study abroad should be more fully integrated with undergraduate education on the home campus. Beginning with freshman advising, students should be provided with more information on the opportunities and the requirements at the various campuses. A number of courses now offered to undergraduates would be particularly helpful to students going abroad. Students going to the French campus, for example, should have some knowledge of French history and politics. All students going to that campus might be required to take one or two prescribed courses in those subjects chosen from a recommended list of home campus offerings. Similar lists for other campuses could be easily developed.

Recommendations 7e. and 7f. are interrelated; both are aimed at diversifying not only the academic content of the overseas experience, but its social and personal aspects. None of these proposals requires substantial advance planning; at present some students drop out of a group, and others are added

at the last minute. Similarly, students recently were allowed to make a second visit to an overseas campus. This was because of a shortage of candidates, but what is possible in desperation can also be part of a more flexible and imaginative program.

The overseas campuses should offer greater latitude for independent research by students with adequate preparation. After considering the matter in some detail, we are confident that small groups of students selected on an individual basis could profitably work abroad on their own, each having spent considerable time mapping out a program for independent research with an adviser in Palo Alto and each, while abroad, keeping in periodic touch with his adviser by mail. These students might live on a particular campus, but would not be limited by its course requirements. Students might also be included who had previously participated in the program.

The development of specific academic interests while overseas should be encouraged by allowing qualified students to remain three to six months after the normal six-month period to carry out independent work. Such work could be directed and evaluated by a faculty member at the campus. Finally, we suggest that the campuses experiment with different lengths of stay for different student groups or parts of groups–from three months to a year.

When different outside lecturers bear a major share of the instructional burden in a class, the result seems to be incoherence and diffuseness. Therefore, when outside instructors are desired (and we think that this is a promising approach), courses should be taught by a single person, who will be able to impart the unity of conception and instruction that is impossible in "parade" courses. Otherwise, outside lecturers should be used primarily as adjuncts to the formal curriculum.

The arguments against required courses were stated earlier: students are bored and resentful; faculty, hoping to offer some morsel for each member of the involuntary audience, tend to make the course diffuse rather than focused; the result often is superficiality and low motivation.

When a field trip lasts a week or more it is an experience of sufficient importance to share claims on curricular relevance with the host country. For example, when students at the British campus spend two weeks in Italy, as they did this fall, a course on the Renaissance would enhance the value of their stay immeasurably.

More generally, many testified to this committee that extra-curricular activities at the overseas campuses should be more closely related to the curriculum. In particular, interaction with the native populace at some

campuses is arranged on an *ad hoc* and primarily social basis and is generally insufficient. Contact with nationals should occur more often in course work and research, or in intellectual contexts. The committee has heard numerous complaints from faculty that field trips are often intrusive and disruptive rather than complementary to the work in the classroom. This problem can never be completely solved, but major improvements can, we suspect, be made by more flexible arrangements along the lines we have proposed. Specifically, we suggest experiments with field trips, weekend travel, and perhaps the three-week break for projects developed as integral parts of a course.

4. The Three Special Language Programs

Description of the Programs

Three special language programs—at Hamburg, Tours, and Salamanca—are open to undergraduate and graduate language majors. Students in German history may also participate in the Hamburg program, and those in Spanish history, Latin American Studies, and related disciplines may join the Salamanca program. Each program affords students an opportunity to develop language proficiency and to immerse themselves in the life and culture of a foreign country. Each involves both study at a foreign university and work under the supervision of a Stanford professor. Most students in the programs live in international student dormitories. The three programs are jointly administered by the respective language departments, which determine all academic and selection policies, living arrangements, and the like, and the Stanford Overseas Campus Office, which is responsible for travel to Europe and other matters related to the programs.

The Hamburg program has been in operation since 1962. Students take courses at the University of Hamburg and participate in various extracurricular activities. A member of the Stanford German Department accompanies the group and supervises the work of its members. Most students who have participated in the program are enthusiastic, particularly because of their involvement in the social and intellectual life of Hamburg.

The French program was first located at Nantes. Most participants in the

program there found it unsatisfactory because of the poor quality of academic instruction at the University of Nantes and their relatively isolated location. The new arrangement at Tours offers an opportunity to use the new facilities of the Faculté des Lettres at Tours and closer proximity to Paris.

Salamanca was chosen as the provisional site for the Spanish program after political problems at the University of Madrid forced abandonment of original plans to locate there. Twelve undergraduates and one graduate student are now auditing courses at the University of Salamanca and working under the supervision of a Stanford faculty member.

Appendix 5 includes detailed descriptions and evaluations of the Hamburg, Nantes, and Salamanca programs. It also includes descriptions of the inter-university programs at Rome, Taipei, and Tokyo, and the Stanford-Warsaw exchange program; we make no recommendations concerning these programs.

Recommendations

Policy direction for each of the three special language programs should be the responsibility of a Campus Committee, appointed and staffed as proposed in Recommendation 1, page 7. One faculty member and one student on each of these committees should be from *outside* the language department having primary interest in the program.

a. In general, collaboration between a special language program and a major overseas campus should be decided on a country-by-country basis. In particular, joint activities between the special students at Tours and the students at the overseas campus there should be encouraged.

b. When special students in fields other than the host country language would profit from participation in one of the special programs, this opportunity should be offered.

c. No commitments concerning the Spanish program at Salamanca should be made except on a temporary basis until the value of the program in its present location has been established.

In general, the special language programs are extremely well run and should serve as valuable sources of ideas for the five major campuses. Our recommendations concerning policy direction and our three secondary suggestions are self-explanatory.

November 1, 1968

Thomas Ehrlich, *Chairman*
Mark U. Edwards, Jr.
Ivo J. Lederer (*ex-officio*)
David Levin (until September 1968)
Rodney Levine
Nathan Maccoby
Walter H. Sokel
Raymond E. Wolfinger
Richard Bale, *Staff assistant*

Appendix 1 Description of the Stanford Overseas Campus Program[1]

The Stanford Overseas Campus Program, originally conceived as an extension of the General Studies Program, began in June 1958, with the gathering of 63 undergraduate students, five faculty, and staff on an estate outside Stuttgart, Germany. In the ten years since that date, campuses have also been established in France (1960), Italy (1960), Austria (1965), and England (1966). More than 5,000 undergraduates have studied for six months at one of these European campuses. Approximately 55 percent of Stanford undergraduates now participate in the program. It is the largest study abroad effort of any university in the world.

The following goals of the Overseas Campus Program were stated by the Subcommittee on Overseas Campuses of the Committee on General Studies and approved by the parent committee on March 8, 1967:

> The primary purpose of the Stanford Overseas Campus Program as an extension of the General Studies Program, is to further the liberal education of Stanford students. This program of study abroad must thus be seen as a part of an educational process and not as an opportunity for tourism or for an extended vacation abroad. By including such a program in its general studies, Stanford intends to develop new perspectives and insights in its students, especially toward themselves and toward their own American culture.
>
> These perspectives and insights arise from new discoveries and from the challenge to unexamined views. A close examination of the traditions, customs, culture, and values of a single cultural area can provide this challenge and can establish a concrete basis for comparison with our own culture. A thorough introduction to one country can stimulate the profound thinking which is the basis of a liberal education. A highly purposeful experience, that is related to the cultural area in which the campus is located, will contribute to the liberal education of Stanford students. It will establish perspectives through which both Europeans and American society can be viewed.

Many American study abroad plans are designed for language or area specialists. The Stanford Overseas Campus Program, however, was designed as a general education program for all students. On the assumption that the program is valuable for all students, regardless of their fields, the program's administrators have encouraged maximum attendance at the overseas campus. In order to attract large numbers of undergraduates, the program was developed as an integral part of the undergraduate General Studies program. The campus calendars are synchronized with the home campus calendar; tuition, room, and board rates (which include the eastbound flight) are the same; and full academic credit is given for overseas work. Scholarships are continued during overseas study and language requirements are kept to a minimum–two quarters of instruction before departure. Thus almost any undergraduate can easily afford the six-month program–in financial and academic terms.

The campuses house Stanford students only, in order to facilitate both shared experiences while overseas and continued relationships afterward. (Economic considerations and the severe housing problems of many junior year abroad programs also contributed to the decision to house all students and faculty together.) The original five locations for the campuses, with the exception of Florence, were chosen in small cities or rural areas. The program administrators believed these areas would provide greater interaction with the populace because they were not flooded with students and would force greater use of the foreign language because of the relative lack of English-speaking natives.

[1] This description was written in consultation with the Overseas Campus Office.

Administration

The Overseas Campus Program is headed by Professor Robert A. Walker, Chairman of the Committee on General Studies. Professor Walker works with the Subcommittee on Overseas Campuses of the Committee on General Studies (which he also chairs) in determining policies for the overseas campuses and in making decisions on curriculum and selection of faculty and students. During 1966 the duties of the subcommittee were expanded to include orientation programs and wider academic questions. The subcommittee is not concerned with administrative procedures, such as financing and leasing.

On the local level each campus is administered by a Director of Studies and a Director of Administration. (France is an exception, where both duties are shared by a director and an associate director.) The faculty is composed of two members of the home faculty (whose six-month stays are usually overlapping so that each group is exposed to three Stanford faculty), and various native language instructors. The English campus, of course, has no language instruction; instead, two courses, English Civilization and Technology and Social Change, are taught there, using full-time tutors and visiting lecturers from local universities. The supporting staff of the campuses is composed of secretaries, a graduate assistant, cooks, gardeners, and various particular aides (e.g., a library aide in Italy, language laboratory aides in Germany and France).

There is close home campus administrative control of the European campuses. Daily contact is maintained by mail and Professor Walker makes three or four visits per year to each campus. All matters concerning the administration of the program, with the exception of grades and unit changes, which go directly to the Registrar, are channeled through the Stanford Overseas Campus Office, and all changes are subject to approval by that office. In addition to Dr. Walker's visits, reports of which are submitted to the Subcommittee on Overseas Campuses, several of the staff of the Overseas Campus Office make periodic trips to the campuses, and the European directors meet once a year to discuss common problems. The overseas directors also visit the Stanford campus for at least a week at least once every two years.

Funding

The Overseas Campus Program was initiated with a $15,000 Ford Foundation grant for exploratory work in 1956. In 1961 a gift of $15,000 was divided equally among the three campuses for library acquisition; $10,000 was later allocated by the University for similar purposes on the two new campuses, Britain and Austria. Apart from these grants, the program has been financed solely from student fees.

Academic Calendar

Groups leave for France, Italy, and Austria in September and March, for Britain and Germany in January and June. Orientation periods abroad vary from three days to one week, and the two quarters are of ten and eleven weeks. To allow for traveling, classes run from Monday to Thursday, and one week is set aside each quarter for a mandatory all-campus field trip. Between quarters, three full weeks are allowed for free travel. Variations may be made on this schedule, e.g., a two-week field trip, but the missed days must be made up at another time.

Faculty Selection

Selection of faculty is largely informal and is handled primarily through Professor Walker. Most faculty participants apply for appointments themselves; some are encouraged to do so by a depart-

ment head or committee member. Formal selection is made by the Subcommittee on Overseas Campuses after consultation with the department head and approval of the submitted proposal of courses.

Student Selection

Students are selected primarily on the basis of cumulative grade point average. Several minor criteria are also considered: 1) personal ratings by the residence staff with regard to any special living problems of the applicant; 2) a health service review of the applicant for problems of physical or mental health; 3) review of University status—those on social or academic probation are normally prohibited; 4) grades in language courses (also reviewed after selection).

Selection is made of 80 German students, 80 France students, 88 Italy students, 80 Britain students, and 80 Austria students. Generally, there is an alternate (waiting) list of approximately 20 men and 15 women.

Slightly over 800 students attend the campuses each year. Based on average figures since 1962, about 62 percent sophomores, 30 percent juniors, and 8 percent seniors make up this figure. At any one time, about 17 percent of the sophomore class and 8 percent of the junior class will be abroad. For any academic year, about one-third of the sophomores and one-sixth of the juniors will have been away for six months. (The increase in Stanford undergraduate enrollment since 1958 is approximately equal to the number attending the overseas campuses during the year.) The ratio between male and female students abroad is about 1.6 to 1.0.

Selection is made in December for the June Britain and Germany groups, and the September groups in Austria, France, and Italy. In March, selection is made for January groups in Britain and Germany, and the March groups in Austria, France, and Italy.

Prerequisites

In order to attend an overseas campus, an undergraduate must normally be in residence at Stanford at the time of application and the quarter before departure. He must attend all orientation programs and must complete two quarters of the language at Stanford before departure. After selection the candidate's academic and personal record are reviewed prior to departure.

Faculty Orientation Programs

With announcement of selection, the Stanford faculty member going overseas is furnished with a printed manual, which briefly outlines a number of topics from practical details, such as rental of a typewriter, to questions of social responsibility. There is one intensive orientation session at Professor Walker's home, where faculty going overseas have an opportunity to meet and discuss problems with "alumni" faculty.

Students Orientation Programs

The orientation program for each campus consists of a series of weekly meetings during the quarter preceding departure. Lectures on general European topics given to all groups are followed by lectures to individual groups on topics related to their host country. Responsibility for each group's program is in the hands of a committee composed of one alumni professor, one returned student, and a member of the Overseas Campus staff.

Post-Overseas Programs

In 1964, an ASSU group, the Associated Alumni of the Overseas Campuses, was formed to conduct follow-up activities (related to the host countries) of an intellectual nature. The group is not presently active.

Beginning informally in 1961, the Overseas Campus Board, a non-ASSU group, has assisted the Overseas Campus Office in the orientation program, as well as participating in critical review and criticism of the Overseas Campus Program. In 1966, an Ad-Hoc Committee of the Board under the chairmanship of Stephen A. Martindale published an evaluation and review of the Overseas Campus Program "from the student's point of view."

The Overseas Campus Office occasionally sponsors other events, such as a speech by a national of one of the host countries.

Locations

Germany, Starting date: June 1958
The German campus is located in Beutelsbach, about twelve miles from Stuttgart, in southwestern Germany. Beutelsbach, population 5,000, is thirty minutes by train from Stuttgart. That city, with a population of 700,000, has become a center of the German electro-technical, automotive, and book-publishing industries. It supports a technical university, two theaters, an opera, a symphony orchestra, museums, and art galleries. The campus is a cluster of six buildings on a thirty-acre estate, formerly used as a convalescent home and asylum; the current University lease expires in approximately eight years.

Italy, Starting date: September 1960
The Italian campus is located on the edge of Florence at the Villa San Paolo. The campus is ten minutes from the center of Florence (population 400,000) by bus, four hours by train north of Rome, and four hours by train south of Milan. The University's lease with the owners, the Teaching Order of the Barnabiti, is for renewable three-year periods; it has just been renewed.

France, Starting date: September 1960
The French campus is located on the western edge of the city of Tours, on the banks of the Loire River. The four-story stone and concrete building, leased from the French Ministry of Education, provides under one roof all the facilities for teaching and living. The building is leased to the University for renewable three-year periods. Tours is a city of 100,000, a center of agriculture, wine making, printing, and the silk industry. A branch of the University of Orleans is also located at Tours; the School of Letters and Arts has recently been relocated adjacent to the campus. The former USIS Library in Tours, across the street from the campus, was acquired by Stanford in France through a grant from the USIA; it continues to serve both Stanford students and the public. Next door to Stanford is the Institute of Fine Arts, part of a growing Cultural Center developed by the City of Tours and the University of Orleans. Paris is approximately 135 miles to the northeast, about two and a half hours by train.

Austria, Starting date: September 1965
The Austrian campus was formerly located in the Hotel Panhans in the village of Semmering (approximately 60 miles from Vienna). It was relocated in the fall of 1967 in the heart of Vienna. The new building is in the main commercial and cultural area of Vienna known as "The Ring." The structure is leased from the Caritas, a branch of the Roman Catholic Church, which retains some of its students on the fourth floor.

Britain, Starting date: January 1966
The British campus is located in Harlaxton Manor (built 1837), three miles from the town of Grantham (population 30,000), in the agricultural area east of the industrial Midlands. The cities of Nottingham and Leicester are within an hour's drive; Cambridge is approximately one hour and a half away. The campus is located 110 miles north of London, about a two-hour train ride.

Appendix 2 Overseas Interviews: Report by Richard Bale

Introduction

During December 1967 and January 1968 I visited the five Stanford overseas campuses as staff representative for the Committee on Study Abroad. The purpose of these visits was to ascertain the views of campus directors, overseas faculty, and participating students on a variety of issues. Twenty students chosen at random were interviewed at each campus–a total of 100 at the five campuses.

The following report is a brief summary of opinions expressed both in formal interviews and informal discussions. The report may seem unduly negative. My purpose was not to record the strengths of the program, however, but to learn about those areas where improvement is needed. Some matters of secondary importance, such as the quality of food, change from month to month, so comments on those issues should be viewed cautiously. My personal biases are undoubtedly a factor in the report, although I sought to report objectively and impartially.

Administration

The directors stated, and it was immediately evident, that virtually every academic and maintenance decision is made only with the prior and complete consent of the Overseas Campus Office. The element of distance makes any but simple policy changes impossible without a considerable time delay. As a result, most directors felt they were able to exercise little initiative in academic planning. Many faculty and students felt (and many directors concurred) that without considerably more responsibility at the local level there would continue to exist an impotent academic leadership, an unnecessary vacuum created by the restriction of men who in many cases were regarded as highly competent scholars.

General academic policy, the directors reported, is discussed at yearly meetings with representatives of the Overseas Campus Office. These are regarded as helpful but less than adequate, in part because local problems cannot be dealt with in sufficient depth. Most importantly, they felt a need for much greater contact with Stanford home departments and faculty. The directors expressed concomitant feelings of responsibility to and estrangement from the University and felt there existed an unfortunate separation from other educational components of Stanford. The relation of directors and local instructors to the Stanford faculty was more than unpleasantly vague, and one professor raised serious questions as to the academic freedom of some instructors.

In spite of this dissatisfaction, however, all directors stated that in general they had encountered few problems in eventual approval of recommendations. In general they found their relationship with the Overseas Campus Office to be expedient and satisfactory. Communication was rapid, and almost all routine academic matters were settled swiftly and with little delay. While most directors felt strongly that their communication with and knowledge of Stanford departments was quite inadequate, all believed that communication with a central office on administrative matters was highly desirable. Most were fearful that full coordination with departments, for example, would be highly costly in time and energy.

Location

Very few problems or complaints about location were heard from directors, faculty, and students in Italy, Austria, and Germany. The Vienna location has apparently been quite successful in its first four months, although the development of contact with Viennese is still to be accomplished. The Germany

location suffers from its substantial distance from a university, and the resultant lack of available native students. The Villa San Paolo in Florence is located outside the city center in the surrounding hills, and many students would have preferred a closer location. The locations in Britain and, to a lesser extent, France, however, received severe criticism.

Britain: Intense dissatisfaction with the location in Grantham pervaded almost every discussion at Stanford in Britain, to the extent that virtually every problem of the campus was related to its location. Students complained of lack of contact with British students, the boring society in Grantham, and the considerable distance from London (about 110 miles). The students explained that transportation to London was expensive (round-trip, second-class rates are about $5 for one day and over $7 otherwise). Few advantages were seen in this location in a backward and declining section of central England.

The directors said that they had explored and would continue to pursue the availability of alternative locations in Britain.[2] They felt an ideal location would be a position between London and one of the major British universities. Both the directors and outside personnel, such as Professor Robert Rhodes-James (formerly at Oxford, currently at Stanford), felt that some academic relationship with Oxford or Cambridge would be feasible and highly desirable. Students, who had been to Oxford during week-long field trips and knew other students from the major universities, concurred.

France: The directors, both of whom have full professorships at the University of Orleans–Tours, had little complaint about the location. Students, however, felt differently. All but two of the students formally interviewed felt that the campus should be relocated, most suggesting a location in or near Paris. They felt generally that Tours was "middle-class, conservative, and dull." In addition, they pointed out that virtually all travel required going through Paris.

One faculty member stated, "The French campus has enormous disadvantages and seems to have neither the advantages of a major city nor the advantages of a rural area–a bad compromise."

Student Selection

Most of the directors, although not very familiar with home office procedures, were seriously concerned about the selection process. Many had noticed a definite decline in the intellectual and motivational level of the students, particularly evident since the opening of the two new campuses in 1965. An often-expressed opinion was that the program was increasingly "taken for granted," and that the students tended to arrive with the attitude, "Well, here I am–what does Europe have to offer *me*?" Directors of several other university programs abroad (Florence and Vienna) and several Stanford and local professors expressed concern whether any program taking 55 percent of a student body (and by its nature necessarily not very selective) could produce enough students of sufficient interest, motivation, and intellectual competence. In summary, the concerns fell into two major considerations: first, that a 55-percent program would include many students *incapable* of a valuable experience overseas, and, secondly, that the very lack of a "selective atmosphere" produced a lackadaisical and lethargic attitude.

The directors explained their great concern for the inclusion of a few ill-equipped students with the observation that, in such a tight, cohesive living situation, even a very few such students often had a malevolent and contagious effect on the whole group. And, in a more indirect manner, the actions of a very few, at odds with the local populace or authorities, were often taken as representative of the entire group, who would, as a group, suffer the consequences.

[2] Since the conduct of this survey, arrangements have been made to relocate the British campus at Cliveden, a point closer to the nation's cultural centers.

No director thought that grade point average should be of major concern in selection, i.e., they had observed little relation between previous GPA and the success of students in the program, and all stressed various personality factors. The most often mentioned traits were open-mindedness, adaptability, social and intellectual maturity, amenability, intellectual curiosity, and lack of destructive impulses. The point of intellectual maturity was put succinctly by a British tutor: "We would prefer to see those students who have answered certain basic questions as to the purpose of intellectual pursuit. The question, for example, 'Why should we study history?' should not arise at an overseas campus. The students would have answered that in previous work." The tutors, however, did not feel this intellectual maturity was necessarily related to age.

Most directors and faculty expressed a desire for greater mixing of classes in the composition of the groups. While it was often felt that "the older the student, the better," it was also thought that the older students would "lend a serious element to the campus" and serve as positive models for younger ones. Younger students were generally observed to be much "groupier"–less willing to take risks and extend themselves–and much more intent on "grade-grubbing." Several directors and faculty thought a few graduate students should be included in the program for this reason. (And for other reasons, which are discussed in *Curriculum*.) The directors agreed that the ratio of men to women should be kept as close as possible and that high ratios produced considerable friction and antagonism within the group, e.g., the resentment of male students toward interaction with and assimilation of male natives into the group. (Observation of student attitudes low vs. high ratio groups was consistent with this thought.)

No directors suggested any concrete improvements for the selection system, although several thought that carefully chosen returned students could profitably assist in selection.

Faculty Selection

The directors almost unanimously objected to the apparent *ad hoc* nature of faculty selection, which seemed without regard for the design of the curriculum as a whole and the interaction and integration of courses. This subject is discussed in *Curriculum*.

Beyond this general consideration, the directors were concerned about several traits of the faculty member overseas. All agreed that he should have experience with and like undergraduates and be willing and capable to mix with them informally. Most expressed a strong disposition against younger faculty who were often "too involved with research" and did not have the time to interact with the students. (In this regard, it should be noted, exceptions were carefully pointed out.)

Many directors and students felt that faculty with young children were not desirable because too much time, particularly at meals, had to be devoted to their care. Two reasons in addition: first, students felt inhibited in visiting the teacher's apartment, and it was often difficult to overcome the noise level; secondly, young children were often sick a great deal of the time, resulting in further loss of time for students and the impossibility of student visits to the apartment. This last point is related to the lack of professorial office space and will be discussed in *Physical Facilities*.

Finally, the directors objected to the selection of a few faculty who did not seem to have a real interest or willingness to adapt to the "European situation," most often manifested in their ineptness with the language (and unwillingness to learn).

Student Preparation

There was considerable disagreement over the nature and desirability of student preparation and orientation before going overseas. While many directors and faculty expressed a desire for academic preparation, such as courses in the social and political history of the country, several objected to the

idea and questioned the efficacy of such efforts. They felt that students would be more able and motivated to learn such material in a much shorter time (with considerable added resources) while overseas.

Those who stressed more academic preparation before departure related it to the general civilization courses (which they felt should be able to assume more background in order to specialize on relevant, modern topics) and the necessity of a basis for discussion with the local populace beginning at the time of arrival. In the words of one director, "little academic momentum is begun" before their arrival on the campus.

Although the directors seemed to be relatively unfamiliar with the formal orientation program (one country's directors had never seen a copy of it), they thought that generally the program had improved over the last two years. They were concerned, however, with one major issue: students seemed to be unaware of the problems they would face overseas. The directors thought that (perhaps because the orientation program was concerned with keeping students "on the ship," several stated) the orientation program tends to sell the program rather than be realistic about the problems of knowing local residents, living constrictions and lack of privacy, rule changes in comparison with the home campus and the rationale for them, academic demands, and so forth. Most directors thought the orientation program had created too much of an emphasis on group cohesiveness, which they felt was often detrimental to the goals of the program.

Students similarly felt a great inadequacy in the orientation program and other preparation, but disagreed among themselves on many aspects of the program. Most did, however, agree on several things. The orientation program cannot possibly succeed in creating any academic momentum in its present *ad hoc*, non-credit state. Explicit, factual information should be communicated in writing rather than by constant oral repetition in large lectures. Returned students should be encouraged to speak much more candidly about problems faced overseas (similar to those mentioned by the directors). Almost without exception, students objected to what they described as a paternalistic attitude toward them by the Overseas Campus Office.

Students were fundamentally concerned that the orientation program had in essence misrepresented the overseas program. They felt that it should advise them to concentrate on one or two particular aspects of the experience, according to their own talents and dispositions, rather than give the impression that a student could easily and successfully master all the various opportunities overseas in six months.

Faculty Orientation

As in the selection process, the directors felt that little concern for the curriculum as a whole had influenced the orientation of the faculty. Very little integration of the courses was perceived, and the faculty themselves complained of this. Directors generally felt that little effort was made to relate courses to the location–not that the relevance was generally low, but that it was extremely uneven for various faculty participants. Directors mentioned frequently that faculty were unaware of student work loads and other demands overseas and varied substantially on the amount of work they expected from students overseas. (Interviewed faculty were about split on this question–half stating their work load was the same as that at home, half stating that they demanded less). Several directors felt that faculty-student review boards consisting of alumni from each campus could assist professors before departure in the planning of their courses, by offering advice as to the particular situation overseas and its relation to student attitudes and opportunities for relevance to academic work. Faculty stressed the need for more informal interaction with other returned faculty before departure.

Length of Stay

Without exception, every director, faculty member, and student interviewed approved highly of any option for extending the six-month stay. Over 80 percent of the students said that they would exercise such an option for three to six months of independent or specialized study. Many directors, faculty, and students felt that only at the end of six months were students reaching a point at which they felt fairly comfortable with the new environment and facile with the language–and were beginning to enjoy a valuable engagement with the culture. Directors of longer study-abroad programs in Florence and Vienna concurred with this view, stating that their students' valuable experiences were almost entirely in the last half of nine- or eleven-month stays.

If a proposal for an extended stay can be generalized from all comments received, it would be three to six months of academic work, coordinated with a member of the Stanford or local faculty (or both), possibly (perhaps preferably) in coordination with classes and seminars at a European university. A proposal would be written by the student during his first quarter or early in his second quarter overseas, which would be submitted for approval to the prospective faculty sponsor. At least 13 units of credit would have to be offered, in order that men could retain their 2-S draft deferments. Students would live outside the campus during this second period, either in student dormitories, in apartments, or with private families. The situation should be of their own choosing, but assistance could be given by the campus administration.

There was disagreement on the availability of the extension; some directors and faculty believed it should be open to a large number (20 to 30 students), while others thought it should be much more selective, perhaps limited to only three or four students. One professor expressed concern that the option would only be available to more affluent students and that some special consideration should be given to special loans or grants. Another director, with long experience with various study-abroad programs, thought that it would be very unwise to have longer than a six-month extension, as readjustment problems in the United States would be difficult. Several practical problems were raised, such as added reimbursement to sponsoring faculty and necessary increases of faculty on each campus.

In addition to the aforementioned advantages of an extension, directors and faculty noted several other positive aspects of such an option. First, the work might be tied in with more advanced work on the home campus, achieving integration of the overseas campuses with the total undergraduate experience. Second, the existence of such an option, and its required proposal paper, could serve to intensify and mature student academic life, to channel and focus students' interest in the course work during the first two quarters while searching for a worthwhile topic and related material for specialization. Third, it was felt that the presence of some "graduates" of the six-month program nearby would be a potentially valuable influence on the next overseas group. In acting as informal advisers and guides, they might serve to overcome the troublesome lack of continuity that was mentioned by almost every director. Fourth, it was felt that students would greatly profit from the opportunity to live in a different situation, and, along with developed language proficiency, interact much more closely with native students and families. It should be noted that although most directors agreed in principle with the idea of having students live in a group during the first six months, all regarded other living arrangements as highly desirable after the initial six months of acclimation. Fifth, it was felt that the longer stay would reduce the frenetic long-range traveling of many students and perhaps focus part of their traveling on topics relevant to their proposal.

Students, who expressed overwhelming approval for such a possibility, reacted primarily to the fourth point above. That is, their initial reaction was to view an extension option as an opportunity for other living arrangements and greater interaction with natives. Less often was a comment made pertaining to the pursuit of specialized interests that had developed during their stay. This may,

however, have been an initial reaction without sufficient time for serious thought, and one can only speculate as to the effect of an extension option known to the students from the time of acceptance into the program.

Residence Overseas

Each director was asked to comment on the desirability of grouping 80 American students in one location overseas, i.e., "the branch campus" system. Three of the ten directors objected strongly to the idea, stating that "the cohesiveness prevents engagement with the culture," "students spend too much time merely getting used to living together," and "the group altogether too often acts as some sort of family surrogate, and really hinders the kind of exposure to our culture that the program ought to be seeking." Support for this position was voiced by approximately half of the faculty interviewed.

A common view held by these people was that the interdependence of students prevented their dependence on themselves and natives, which was a primary block to deep engagement with the foreign culture. Another major disadvantage mentioned was that any misfit students had a potentially harmful and contagious effect on the entire group, an influence far beyond their proportional representation.

None of the other directors and faculty denied these disadvantages, but it was thought that either 1) practical considerations made it the only feasible system, or 2) other advantages tended to outweigh the disadvantages. Several directors, particularly those with previous or current experience with other study-abroad programs, outlined serious problems that would be involved with any alternative living arrangements. Although difficult to do (apparently impossible in Florence), accommodations could be found for 80 students with private families. But the general feeling was that either the families would only be interested in the students from a financial (or in some cases, status) viewpoint, or that the living experience itself (often in an uneducated family) would not be of sufficient intellectual challenge to the student. The latter point was made most strongly by directors and faculty in Britain, who felt that one primary purpose of living with a family was to develop language proficiency, obviously in that case inapplicable. As to possibilities for housing in student dormitories, apart from the serious lack of available space, several directors felt that the inclusion of a small proportion of American students in such a dormitory would result in far greater *de facto* isolation of the Americans throughout the whole experience. Several directors gave many examples of the severe problems encountered by students in other programs and in other living conditions.

Apart from the practical considerations, most directors and several faculty saw distinct advantages in the system. First, it offered a sanctuary of support to many students who were not capable of being fully immersed in a totally foreign culture. Ideally, it served as a base from which explorations could be made and induced students to take risks of engagement with another culture that they might shrink from if "totally exposed" in a different living situation. Second, students were able to learn a great deal from each other on curricular and extra-curricular topics, in a way impossible in the more diffuse home living situation. Third, for many faculty it was a unique opportunity to come to know intimately a group of undergraduates, something which they were not able to do at home.

Many directors and faculty (and many students), regardless of their attitude on the issues raised above, felt that students spent far too much time and energy worrying about the "group experience." One instructor, describing what he termed the "mystique of the group experience," said "Students feel they *should* have a 'group experience' whether they really *want* one or not." Long discussions with students bore out this criticism. Many students felt that the overriding concern was engendered purposely during the orientation program and distinctly reflected the wishes of the Overseas Campus Office. Virtually all agreed that too much emphasis was placed on the "jelling" of groups, with less attention given to the formidable problems of engagement with the culture.

In summary, opinions of directors, faculty, and students bore out the fact that an overseas base of the Stanford kind is not in itself necessarily good or bad. The success of this residential program depends to a large extent on the expectations of students and the leadership of faculty, in order to exploit its advantages while avoiding its very obvious dangers as a cultural surrogate.

Curriculum

The central academic concern of the directors was that the curriculum at their campuses was not unified. Many directors felt that this problem originated in the apparent *ad hoc* selection and pairing of the various faculty, that faculty members were selected on the basis of their own personal desires and departmental arrangements rather than from any concern for an integrated curriculum. The curriculum, then, became the "accident of various political factors." As they were not involved in the choice of professors, they felt initially separated from the planning of the curriculum.

During the period after selection and before arrival of the professors, the directors received little information on the courses to be taught. One director said, "At present, we are simply informed in a very brief manner of the general scope of the professors' courses abroad, and often we will unnecessarily overlap in our presentations, or miss genuine opportunities for constructive coordination." A local professor stated, "We have been seriously handicapped in the past, and our knowledge of the content of the Stanford professor's course coming overseas has been sketchy at best. We have failed to interact where we might and often duplicated a lot of material." Another director: "It would be very helpful for us to have advance knowledge in detail of the courses to be taught. This would enable us to coordinate our series of guest lecturers to a greater extent than has been done." Another director stated, "There should be far more integration of our courses here. And this will, of course, depend upon more advanced and detailed word from the home office as to the content of Stanford professors' courses."

Relevance

The directors and students all stated that relevance was the *sine qua non* for all teaching overseas. The most common type–termed the "informational aspect" by one director–was defined as the frequency of actual monuments, art museums, or objects in the environment as references in the curriculum. But directors, and particularly students, recognized other modes of relevance, which often were of greater importance. First, there was what one director termed the "intellectual aspect" of relevance, which stimulates an intellectual reaction of a more general nature. This aspect of relevance can take many forms. For the non-specialist it may mean the concentration on the relevance of history to present-day problems, for example, the influence of the *Risorgimento* on modern-day Italian politics, rather than studying the *Risorgimento* only in itself. It may also mean the relevance of phenomena found here in Italy to that at home, for example, the relation of Italian Communism to students' preconceptions of the Communist system.

Some courses that did not seem particularly relevant (such as Postwar British Drama taught in Britain and not adapted to any current theatrical production in London, or Chaucer taught in France) were very successful and considered highly relevant by students. As one said, "The course was relevant because it dealt with the kinds of common personal issues that are being faced in this unique setting by us all. The course forms a basis of articulation and pervades our intellectual *and* social lives." The professor, whose course the statement refers to, commented "Participation on a wide basis is essential to the overseas campus in order to exploit the particular kind of living situation we have. The meeting of extremely diverse people and diverse ways of looking at things is certainly important in my seminar.

The opportunity for students of various different majors to interact with one another both in and out of the seminar is very valuable and it couldn't occur at the home campus . . . I seek to break down any barriers between the classroom and the personal life of the student, and ideally these two at Stanford in Britain go on very close to each other."

Students placed more importance on the availability of seminars than on any other aspect of the overseas program. They stated that, much more than on the home campus, seminars were of crucial importance overseas, that oral expression was extremely important in their particular living situation. On those campuses where seminars were given, students had a substantially different viewpoint of the curriculum and themselves. In the words of one student, "This experience of carrying a discussion for one quarter in and out of the classroom, where my views are tempered and developed in each situation, has introduced me to a whole new concept in my education. It never occurred to me before, and I really never had the opportunity to know, that I can learn a great deal from my fellow students." That the individual professors have a strategic effect on this interaction between students was pointed out by many directors, one of whom said, "The Stanford professors have an enormous effect on our students and are the central factor in the success in any group . . . Their leadership and example is very influential on the students, affecting not only their intellectual curiosity and their modes of traveling, but even their interaction with each other."

Most warned, however, that in the present faculty selection process stress on relevance could sometimes be dangerous. That is, occasionally a professor found himself teaching "relevant" material, out of his expertise, with usually disastrous results.

Civilization Courses

All campuses except Italy have two-unit courses in the civilization of the host country. (In Italy, two courses, The High Renaissance and Politics of Italy, are taught by the directors during each term.) In Britain, the civilization courses are taught using guest lecturers with loosely coordinating sections by the tutors. The director and tutors find the situation unworkable and the scope much too broad. They hope to move into much more specialization by the tutors in seminars, with closely coordinated guest lectures. In France, a similar situation exists, with students and directors finding the scope of the course much too broad for deep intellectual involvement. The situation here is somewhat ameliorated by the recent addition of a section of the course that is much more specialized and is taught entirely in French.

The Austrian civilization course is intensely disliked by all students, and serious problems are recognized by the Director of Studies. The scope of the course, which is taught by one man, includes Austrian history, economics, politics, education, transportation, resources, literature, art, music, theater, and customs. The textbook is *Facts and Figures*, an extensive booklet put out by the government basically for tourists. The director hopes to move the course into greater specialization within the "scholastic capability" of the instructor.

These problems were anticipated by the German Academic Director, who set up the civilization course when he began work at the campus two years ago. As a consequence, the course is composed of a series of guest lectures on German politics, art, and education, with readings and seminar discussions of the topics. The course is extremely popular among the students, who are encouraged to focus on a smaller area of concern in German civilization.

Individual Study

While there were few visible barriers to independent reading or research, there was little encouragement by the directors or faculty, and little interest on the part of students. Many faculty felt that such opportunities should be offered within the courses and that few students had shown much interest. A

few directors thought that they (or the faculty) should be compensated financially for any such tutorial work. Most students said that they did not have the time, and few had found any topics of intense interest. Any discussion of individual study, however, encountered a major obstacle: with the exception of Vienna, there were no adequate library facilities.

Graduate Students

A few directors and Stanford faculty said it would be desirable to include American graduate students in the program, who, while continuing their own research relevant to the host country, would serve as teaching assistants or tutors. It was felt that graduate students would bring a needed serious influence to the campus, in addition to allowing extra faculty time for seminars and papers. Many directors and faculty, however, were not enthusiastic about the idea and thought that such a student's role would have to be carefully defined. The principal objections were that 1) the graduate students would cluster together and avoid the undergraduates; 2) they would be far too busy with research to have any time for undergraduates; or 3) it would be unnatural and uncomfortable to have graduate students living next to undergraduates. At the same time, many directors expressed the apparently contradictory worry that the graduate students would become close to the undergraduate students and act as an undesirable buffer between students and faculty. Some suggested that native graduate students would be preferable but saw substantial problems with this idea. It should be noted here that it was unanimously felt by directors, faculty, and students at Stanford in Britain that the English tutors were an unqualified success.

Language Instruction

All language instructors interviewed felt that there was inadequate communication with the home campus department, but none wished to become formally tied to the departments, as they felt language instruction overseas should fulfill a different purpose than that at home. The feeling was summarized by one instructor, "I think our relationship with the home campus [department] is not as fluent as it ought to be. I don't mean by this that we should simply be an extension of the home campus' needs and desires . . . I think what is done here in language should be quite different from what is done at home. The students have an obviously greater need for modern speech, and we should be able to a much greater extent than now possible, to exchange ideas in class. The problem that exists, of course, is that it is necessary to plan our courses so that the students may return to further language study on the home campus. Our neglect of literature and formal grammar study here might result in serious consequences for them on their return."

Most students echoed this dissatisfaction, feeling that they had a great need for idiomatic speech and more conversation practice in class. They felt that this was being sacrificed in order to study the required literature in order to keep up with the home campus requirements. This, they felt, was highly unrealistic, as few of them would be returning to a language major.

Most instructors wanted some use of the language in other courses to integrate academic efforts. An example was an anthropology course at Beutelsbach which required students in their research to engage in conversation with local residents. Each time this course had been taught, the instructors noted, the level of competence and interest in their classes rose markedly.

French and Italian instructors felt that the two-quarter prerequisite was realistic and adequate. The German instructors, however, felt that the two-quarter requirement was insufficient for German (although some thought that to require more would be infeasible for a program of the present size). An instructor in Vienna said, "The two-quarter prerequisite in German doesn't make sense, as it might in other languages. For, until they [students] are through three quarters, they have not mastered fundamental grammar and are not really ready to go out and use their German. We end up, therefore,

with the majority of our students spending an entire quarter finishing up their grammar, and thus, the students can't really begin an interaction [with the local populace] until almost the end of their stay. This causes a great deal of difficulty, because the students expect to be able to converse in German when they arrive here, and the unexpected disappointment results in quite a bit of frustration." Most of the students who had come over with two quarters of German concurred with this viewpoint.

All instructors interviewed felt that any opportunity to teach on the home campus for one or two quarters would be extremely valuable to their teaching abilities overseas. Along with mentioning the desirability of getting to know home campus department methods, many comments pertained to becoming acquainted with the general social milieu from which the students came.

Apart from a French teacher, all instructors felt that grades were quite important in the motivation of their students, and some recommended stricter evaluation.

Interaction with Populace

With the exception of Germany, contact between students and native students or families was surprisingly meager and took place on a purely social level.

Britain: As the nearest students were 24 miles away, contact was difficult, although all students found the English students open, friendly, and interesting. Although exchanges and other social events were accomplished by bussing, students listed the lack of informal relations as one of their primary disappointments. Their contact with families in Grantham was similarly disappointing, and most stated that after one or two meetings, conversations with the local residents were boring. These complaints are related, of course, to the location of the campus.

France: Almost all interaction with the French in Tours is organized through the "family program." At the beginning of each stay many families are invited to a party where they can meet new students. The event was described as similar to a fraternity rush, each family having cards, which they give to the students they like. Unfortunately, several students end up without any family and are not aggressive enough to try again. The satisfaction of those students who did see these families varied considerably. About half stated that they found the families "middle-class and highly conservative." For these students, contact became less frequent during their term.

Very little friendship with native students was observed or reported in Tours. Many students find the French students unfriendly and cold, and abandoned their efforts to meet them after several weeks. The University of Orleans-Tours, unfortunately, is located at the opposite end of the town, and relatively few students are found in the campus area. Organized contact with students had been entirely with lycée students (14 to 16 years old) with whom almost all the students were uncomfortable.

Italy: Students have found Florentine society virtually unapproachable, and very few reported knowing students or families. Female students found any meaningful acquaintance with Italian males impossible, and native girls were apparently nowhere to be seen. Several organized social events had turned out to be disasters, the students being highly uncomfortable and unable to converse with the Italian students. Other American study-abroad programs had similar problems, although the Director of the Gonzaga University program claimed tremendous success with the inclusion of 40 Italian students on the top floor of their residence. (It was later discovered, however, that Gonzaga was attempting to move out of this situation into a different location where its students would be isolated.) Syracuse University had uneven success in placing its students with Italian families, as many families seemed interested only in making money from the situation.

Austria: The Austria directors found the situation in Vienna, as expected, to be much more difficult than Semmering. Students, too, reported very little contact with Viennese students or families. They found that the Austrian students were either very serious about their academic work and not prone to socialize or the "completely non-intellectual, beer-drinking type." Surprisingly, there was almost no friendship between the students and 40 Austrians living on the fourth floor of the same building. Our students complained that the Austrian students were too old (average age was about 24) and highly professional in their interests.

The director and local instructors, however, thought that matters would improve in time, and that in a mere four months they had not had the opportunity to give adequate attention to the problem.

Germany: Relations with German families in Beutelsbach, developed over the last ten years, are an unqualified success. In past years Berg students have been involved in Beutelsbach theatrical productions, music events, and church affairs. Students maintain close contact with their "families," many going down twice a week for entire evenings. Several have keys to the apartments or houses, and often spend weekends. Although the contact with families could not be improved, there was virtually no contact with any German students, a limitation that students had felt in the past, according to the directors.

*

Several students on each campus, of course, had been successful in meeting either local families or students. Very few of these contacts, with the exception of those in France and Germany, had resulted from any formal program. This success was only slightly related to language ability and is probably due largely to the aggressiveness of the individual student.

Travel & Field Trips

Students listed opportunity for European travel as one of the primary reasons for attending an overseas campus. The policy of three-day weekends obviously sanctions travel as one of the goals of the program.

With the exception of Britain, most students, depending to some extent on their financial status, travel quite widely, often leaving the country during the weekend. The majority visited more than six countries on the three-week break. Directors and professors had mixed feelings about student travel and found it hard to generalize on this point. They were, however, concerned about three things. First, students tended, in their opinion, to travel too far, and often the time spent in transit amounted to more than half the weekend. Students often returned to the campus so exhausted that they were not "back in shape" until Tuesday. Second, little preparation was made for their travels, the students had little idea of what to look for, and much time was lost in orientation on the spot. Third, the students seemed to have little knowledge of their immediate vicinity. (Indeed, many of the Stanford in Austria students knew Florence more intimately than many of the students on the Italian campus.) These points were summarized in a statement by a Stanford teacher in Italy: "The students don't even really know Florence, particularly the wealth of nearby towns within easy distance of the villa. What tends to happen, of course, is that students will simply charge off for two days to Vienna. They won't make any preparation, spend 15 hours on the train getting there, and arrive in Vienna with really no idea of what they are looking for. They find out very quickly, of course, that they won't be able to get any opera tickets on such short notice, for example, and end up spending the evening in some bar, perhaps talking to other Americans traveling through Vienna. At the end of the weekend, they arrive tired and exhausted back at the villa, with fond memories of a few exciting conversations, a few good drinks.

But what has really been learned?" While somewhat exaggerated, this statement does reflect the concern of many that student preparation does (in the words of another faculty member) "consist mainly of waxing one's skis."

Most directors were not too concerned about student travel, perhaps because, as many said, they could see no administrative control possible. (All said they were quite satisfied with the three-day weekend and would not like to see that policy changed.) Many directors, however, did feel that the faculty had an important effect on student travel. Some faculty made a point of recommending certain travel, often relevant to their course, and sometimes gave preparatory lectures. Students reacted eagerly to such help. More directly, several faculty had taken students on one-day field trips on a regular basis. In Britain, for example, one Stanford faculty member conducted a series of one-day field trips related to his courses in British economic history. Students prepared introductory lectures for the trip, others recorded the trip in notes and photographs for use by later groups. This kind of professorial leadership seems to have an indirect "fallout" effect of influencing students to give much closer attention to preparation in their own independent traveling. It was felt that students of these professors were most mature and purposeful in their traveling. Two professors suggested that travel should be recognized more fully as a valuable aspect rather than a "distraction" in the overseas stay, and that it might be integrated more closely with the curriculum by offering academic credit for independent projects or papers written in connection with weekend travel. Students often suggested this and stated that the primary reason for their lack of preparation for trips was the amount of time they had to spend on a full-time academic week compressed into four days. One professor suggested that weekend travel ought to be viewed as a whole, and four units given to a central paper relating to experiences during a quarter of travel.

Field Trips

Each campus takes two field trips of a week in length during the six months. These are never directly related to courses at the campus. This aspect of the program is virtually unanimously commended by directors, faculty, and students.

Physical Facilities & Food

Following is a short review of the opinions of directors, faculty, and students of the physical facilities and food at their campuses. Two common problems existed at all campuses: professors complained about the lack of any adequate office space, and students were concerned about inadequate lighting for study. It was difficult to draw any firm conclusions on the food situation as its quality often changes. Complaints from students, of course, are always heard on any institutional food, and, apart from Austria, one might often question their merit.

Britain: Apart from the location, the manor itself seemed to be quite adequate and comfortable, and few complaints were voiced as to accommodations (relatively spacious) or study space. The food was adequate. One real complaint was heard: the cold water in the showers hadn't worked in five months. (The author unfortunately verified this situation.)

The location of the campus (locally) is quite inconvenient. The nearest shopping facilities are three miles away.

France: Students generally found the campus cramped, the major complaint being the lack of a common lounge or gathering area. This was important for two reasons. First, it provided little chance for students to meet informally (an obvious advantage in Britain). Second, it was difficult to invite any

French friends over; there simply was no place to go. Study space was quite limited and many students did much of their reading in a nearby cafe. The food was adequate, and few complaints were heard. Recreational facilities were poor; the directors are hoping to arrange something along this line in cooperation with other schools.

The location, on the Loire at one end of Tours, is quite convenient for day-to-day student needs.

Italy: Students generally had few complaints about the living accommodations (also quite constricted), but the campus had a very serious lack of study space and lighting. As in France, the students had a great need for a lounge of some sort and are currently converting a weight room into one by themselves. The food was quite good and generally well liked by the students. Recreational facilities were very poor.

Access to Florence is sometimes difficult but most students do not find their location on the edge of the city particularly disadvantageous.

Germany: Located in six different buildings, the campus in Beutelsbach has relatively excellent study facilities and lighting. Most of the accommodations are spacious in comparison to France, Italy, and Ausria. The food was quite good. Lounge facilities were adequate, with space adjacent to the dining area and a separate rathskeller. Students did object to the isolation (on a hill a mile from Beutelsbach), but a constant mini-bus service seemed to satisfy most of them.

Austria: Physical facilities, apart from study areas, are by far the worst in Austria, but surprisingly few complaints were heard. The double rooms were marginally adequate for singles by American standards and half the students were sleeping on mattresses placed on top of clothes closets. (They would reach these usually by a chair placed on top of a desk.) Recreational facilities did not exist at the campus, but many students have found abundant opportunities for a variety of sports in the city. The administration has aided this effort considerably. Lounge facilities, as in France and Italy, were inadequate for visiting Viennese. Food served at this campus was quite bad, and certainly merited the intense dissatisfaction of the students. Many students were forced to supplement (or replace) their meals by eating elsewhere in Vienna. The location in Vienna could hardly have been better chosen according to directors, faculty, and students.

Appendix 3 Faculty Questionnaire Findings

Introduction

In February 1968, each member of the Stanford faculty who had taught at an overseas campus was sent a questionnaire, soliciting opinions on a variety of issues ranging from the general goals of the Overseas Campus Program to the quality of the food at the campuses. Exactly 100 members of the faculty had taught overseas (some more than once). Of this total, 14 had left Stanford and 15 were not available (they were at an overseas campus or on sabbatical). Of the remaining 71, all responded.

The results appear in the format of the questionnaire. Some redundant questions were not tabulated and have been omitted. After each question, the results are listed *in percentage figures* for an all-campus average ("total") and separately for each campus. Open-ended questions have been coded into relevant categories; percentage figures in these areas, because of multiple responses, total more than 100 percent.

Of the 71 faculty members, 19 were most recently at Stanford in Germany, 19 at Stanford in Italy, 17 at Stanford in France, 10 at Stanford in Austria, and 6 at Stanford in Britain. The individual campus results are given under the first initial for each campus: G, A, B, I, F, for Germany, Austria, Britain, Italy, and France, respectively.

1. Was this campus your first choice?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Yes	85	84	90	50	100	77
No	11	10	10	50	0	12
Was asked to go	3	6	0	0	0	6
No answer	1	0	0	0	0	6

2. Very briefly, why did you choose to teach at an overseas campus?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Be in Europe	47	32	30	50	53	59
Faculty-student contact	28	26	30	33	26	36
Teaching opportunity	15	16	10	17	22	12
Professional interests	13	16	10	17	22	6
Curious about program	13	16	10	0	22	6
Asked by administration	10	16	0	33	0	12
Could contribute in unique way	10	16	10	17	6	6
Change of pace	8	6	30	0	6	6
Language experience	4	6	0	0	0	12
Thought program valuable to students	4	10	0	0	0	6

3. If you had it to do over again, would you teach at an overseas campus?

	Definitely	*Probably*	*Don't know*	*Probably Not*	*Definitely Not*
Total	64	19	10	6	1
G	68	22	10	0	0
A	50	30	0	10	10
B	92	0	8	0	0
I	64	16	10	10	0
F	54	23	17	6	0

4. In general, how would you rate the campus at which you taught with respect to each of the following considerations (in addition to the responses indicated below, we would appreciate comments you would like to make about any of these points):

	Excellent	*Good*	*Fair*	*Poor*	*Don't Know*	*Other*
The quality of language courses taught at campus						
Total	28	40	14	0	14	4
G	31	31	16	0	16	6
A	0	70	20	0	10	0
I	37	37	10	0	10	6
F	29	36	12	0	17	6
The quality of visiting lecturers						
Total	16	34	37	9	2	2
G	10	32	58	0	0	0
A	0	20	50	10	20	0
B	0	17	50	33	0	0
I	31	31	22	10	0	6
F	17	54	17	6	0	6
Extent of student exposure to host country culture						
Total	18	50	18	12	1	1
G	16	58	10	10	6	0
A	0	60	20	20	0	0
B	0	33	50	17	0	0
I	32	48	10	10	0	0
F	23	42	23	6	0	6
The campus program for contact between students and host country residents						
Total	31	35	23	10	1	0
G	48	42	10	0	0	0
A	0	50	40	10	0	0
B	0	33	17	33	17	0
I	6	32	46	16	0	0
F	71	23	0	6	0	0
The level of contact between students and host country residents						
Total	21	31	30	13	5	0
G	46	32	16	6	0	0
A	0	30	40	20	10	0
B	33	33	33	0	0	0
I	6	26	36	26	6	0
F	17	36	29	6	12	0

	Excellent	*Good*	*Fair*	*Poor*	*Don't Know*	*Other*
Opportunities for travel						
Total	60	37	2	0	1	0
G	58	36	0	0	6	0
A	40	50	10	0	0	0
B	50	50	0	0	0	0
I	68	26	6	0	0	0
F	64	36	0	0	0	0
The mandatory field trips						
Total	58	30	9	2	1	0
G	53	42	5	0	0	0
A	70	20	0	0	10	0
B	17	66	17	0	0	0
I	78	6	6	10	0	0
F	47	36	17	0	0	0
Your prior orientation						
Total	21	34	17	4	24	0
G	22	36	22	6	14	0
A	0	50	30	0	20	0
B	17	0	17	17	49	0
I	32	26	10	6	26	0
F	23	42	12	0	23	0
The students' prior orientation						
Total	9	28	35	14	14	0
G	6	46	16	16	16	0
A	0	20	60	0	20	0
B	0	0	83	17	0	0
I	10	37	27	16	10	0
F	17	13	36	17	17	0
Your relations with resident administrators						
Total	70	23	3	3	0	1
G	72	16	6	6	0	0
A	40	40	10	10	0	0
B	67	33	0	0	0	0
I	78	16	0	0	0	6
F	77	23	0	0	0	0

	Excellent	*Good*	*Fair*	*Poor*	*Don't Know*	*Other*
Your relations with the program administrators in Palo Alto						
Total	65	28	3	0	0	4
G	72	22	0	0	0	6
A	40	60	0	0	0	0
B	67	33	0	0	0	0
I	68	22	0	0	0	10
F	64	24	12	0	0	0
The quality of the host country civilization courses taught by the resident faculty						
Total	12	29	29	13	17	0
G	6	36	26	10	22	0
A	0	0	20	40	40	0
B	0	33	67	0	0	0
I	20	48	20	6	6	0
F	17	17	37	12	17	0
The food served at the campus						
Total	25	27	24	24	0	0
G	6	16	36	42	0	0
A	80	20	0	0	0	0
B	0	17	33	50	0	0
I	48	36	6	10	0	0
F	0	36	41	23	0	0
Your living quarters						
Total	48	32	10	10	0	0
G	40	50	10	0	0	0
A	17	50	33	0	0	0
B	42	36	16	6	0	0
I	6	48	29	17	0	0
F						
The students' living quarters						
Total	16	58	13	3	0	0
G	10	70	10	10	0	0
A	40	60	0	0	0	0
B	0	67	33	0	0	0
I	27	63	10	0	0	0
F	0	88	12	0	0	0

	Excellent	*Good*	*Fair*	*Poor*	*Don't Know*	*Other*
The location of the campus						
Total	42	27	11	20	0	0
G	26	36	16	22	0	0
A	10	0	30	60	0	0
B	0	33	17	50	0	0
I	94	6	0	0	0	0
F	36	52	6	6	0	0
The adequacy of the students' language preparation						
Total	0	26	29	25	0	20
G	0	32	16	26	0	26
A	0	10	40	40	0	10
I	0	26	48	10	0	16
F	0	30	17	30	0	23
The adequacy of the students' prior knowledge of the host country						
Total	0	11	38	40	0	11
G	0	6	36	42	0	16
A	0	10	40	50	0	0
B	0	17	33	50	0	0
I	0	16	52	26	0	6
F	0	12	23	42	0	23
Office facilities for you at the overseas campus						
Total	14	14	20	52	0	0
G	16	21	16	47	0	0
A	50	30	20	0	0	0
B	0	0	66	34	0	0
I	0	0	16	84	0	0
F	12	17	12	59	0	0

5. How would you compare the amount of work required of students in the course(s) *you* taught overseas with what you require at the home campus?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Much more work at home	14	10	10	0	22	17
A little more work at home	32	26	40	17	32	41
About the same home and overseas	48	54	40	83	46	36
A little more work overseas	3	0	10	0	0	6
Much more work overseas	3	10	0	0	0	0

6. How about the courses taught by other Stanford professors?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Much more work at home	13	16	0	0	26	6
A little more work at home	18	6	30	0	16	36
About the same home and overseas	28	26	30	33	32	22
A little more work overseas	1	0	10	0	0	0
Much more work overseas	0	0	0	0	0	0
Don't know	40	52	30	67	26	36

7. How about the courses taught by resident faculty at the overseas campuses? How would you compare the amount of work required by them with that required by comparable courses at home?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Much more work at home	15	10	0	17	38	6
A little more work at home	17	10	30	17	10	23
About the same home and overseas	21	32	30	33	16	6
A little more work overseas	6	10	10	0	0	6
Much more work overseas	1	6	0	0	0	0
Don't know	40	32	30	33	36	59

8. Were your courses integrated with those of other Stanford professors and national instructors?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Yes	21	26	0	33	22	23
No	74	74	90	50	78	77
Some	5	0	10	17	0	0

9. Have you ever at the home campus taught the courses which you taught overseas?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Yes	62	58	80	67	64	52
No	38	42	20	33	36	48

10. How relevant to the host country were the courses you taught?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Highly relevant	65	66	40	33	78	71
Fairly relevant	29	22	50	67	22	23
Not relevant	3	6	10	0	0	0
No answer	3	6	0	0	0	6

11. Did you change your courses substantially to make them more relevant?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Yes	82	64	90	100	88	83
No	14	26	10	0	6	17
No report	4	10	0	0	6	0

12. What was the attitude of the Overseas Campus administration towards implementing your teaching?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Helped	73	74	70	50	84	71
Hindered	1	0	0	17	0	0
Neither	26	26	30	33	16	29

13. What types of students respond best to the overseas campus experience and seem to get the most out of it? (By "type" we mean any classification scheme that seems useful to you: class in school, major, residence, sex, etc.)

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
No judgment possible	16	26	20	33	22	17
Open	11	22	20	33	10	12
Generally motivated	11	6	20	33	16	17
Junior-senior (older)	9	6	0	17	16	23
Non-fraternity	9	6	0	0	16	29
Sophomores-juniors (younger)	8	10	10	17	22	0
Having special interests	8	6	30	17	10	6
Non-science majors	8	16	30	0	6	6
Linguistically prepared	5	16	0	–	6	6
Intelligent	3	0	10	0	6	6
No previous travel experience	2	0	0	17	6	0
Previous travel experience	2	0	10	17	0	0
Language or arts major	2	10	0	0	0	0
Women	2	0	10	0	0	6
Socially mature	1	0	0	0	6	0
Men	1	0	0	0	6	0
Less money	1	0	10	0	0	0
Independent	1	0	0	0	0	6

14. Do you feel that six months is an adequate length of stay for most students?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Yes	86	94	80	100	78	82
No	11	6	20	0	22	6
Depends	3	0	0	0	0	12

15. How do you feel about the four-day week schedule at the overseas campuses?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
For	94	94	100	100	90	88
Against	6	6	0	0	10	12

16. Were you satisfied or dissatisfied with the procedures for selecting faculty to teach overseas?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Satisfied	35	37	20	67	36	29
Dissatisfied	31	37	20	0	32	42
Not familiar with procedures	24	16	40	33	22	23
No opinion	10	10	20	0	10	6

17. Who should the directors of the campus be?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Natives of the country	73	52	100	67	82	70
Stanford faculty	6	16	0	0	0	6
One of each	6	6	0	0	6	12
Person with experience in both countries	4	10	0	0	6	0
Other	3	0	0	0	6	6
No opinion	8	16	0	33	0	6

18. Do you feel that the present location of the campus is desirable?

	G	*A* (Semmering)	*B*	*I*	*F*
Yes	78	0	50	95	64
No	22	100	50	5	36

19. What were the chief disadvantages *to you* of teaching at an overseas campus?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Research and library facilities	28	26	50	0	22	36
Research time	23	16	20	17	36	17
Living pace	17	26	10	0	16	17
Family difficulties	11	16	10	0	10	12
Personal arrangements for trip	10	10	0	33	10	12
Loss of contact with department	8	10	0	33	10	0
Living quarters	7	10	10	0	6	6
Faculty-student contact	7	0	0	0	22	6
Giving required courses	1	6	0	0	0	0
Isolation	1	0	10	0	0	0
Lack of office	1	0	0	0	6	0
Summer salary loss	1	0	0	0	6	0

20. What, in your opinion, are the chief benefits of the Overseas Campus Program to Stanford undergraduates?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
General exposure to foreign culture, lowering of ethnocentrism and parochialism	72	74	90	83	53	77
Interstudent relationships	20	22	40	33	0	23
Faculty-student relationships	16	22	10	17	6	23
Language experience	16	6	40	–	10	17
Social maturity and responsibility	16	10	0	0	42	6
Better perception of U.S.	8	10	0	17	16	0
Self-awareness	4	0	0	17	10	0
Development of specific interest	4	0	10	0	0	10
Learn about European culture	4	6	10	0	0	6
Residence-study situation	3	6	10	0	0	0

21. Were there any aspects of the overseas campuses experience which greatly surprised you? What were they?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Yes	56	58	90	50	53	42
No	44	42	10	50	47	58
Student immaturity	20	0	11	0	30	29
Advantages of faculty-student contact	16	9	22	0	10	14
General success of program	13	18	11	0	10	0
"Groupiness" of students	13	9	0	67	10	0
Low student morale	9	0	22	0	10	0
Student-faculty interpersonal tension	9	0	22	0	0	14
Local administrators' coldness	7	0	11	0	0	14
Student naivete	7	9	0	0	10	0
Student tourism	7	18	0	0	0	0
Nationals' friendliness	7	9	0	33	0	0
Students' frantic social life	7	9	0	0	10	0
Student enthusiasm	7	9	0	0	10	0
Facilities or food bad	7	9	0	0	10	0
Lack of academic control of local administration	4	0	0	0	0	14
Disadvantages of faculty-student contact	4	9	0	0	0	0
Effect on students' selection of major	4	9	0	0	0	0
Bad quality of lectures	4	0	0	0	10	0

22. What were the chief disadvantages of the program to Stanford undergraduates?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Disruption of students' academic program	28	16	40	50	26	29
Required courses	7	6	0	17	16	0
Lack of direction or purpose	6	0	10	0	6	12
Groupiness encourages old habits	4	6	10	0	0	6
Intellectually superficial	4	6	10	0	6	0
Too young	3	10	0	0	0	0
Insufficient language preparation	3	10	0	0	0	0
Isolation	3	6	10	0	0	0
Increased regulations	1	0	0	0	0	6
Readjustment	1	0	0	0	0	6
Cost	1	6	0	0	0	0
Lack of library facilities	1	0	0	0	6	0
Too short a stay for some	1	0	0	0	6	0
Physical isolation difficult	1	0	0	0	6	0
Heightens national prejudices	1	0	0	0	6	0
Inclusion of bad students unfair to others	1	0	0	0	6	0

23. What recommendations would you make to improve the program?

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Better student preparation	25	26	0	83	32	17
Greater course relevance	20	10	20	17	26	23
Better student selection	16	6	20	0	26	17
Better libraries	13	16	10	33	16	0
Tighter faculty selection	13	6	30	17	10	12
Modify or cut field trips	8	0	20	33	6	6
Better faculty preparation	7	6	20	0	10	0
Greater local curricular control	7	10	0	0	10	6
More contact with university students	7	6	0	17	16	0
Better food	7	22	0	17	0	0
More research opportunities	7	0	10	33	10	0
More flexible rules	6	6	10	0	0	17
Reduction of home administration control	6	10	10	0	6	12
Change of location	6	6	0	33	0	6
More contact with local population	6	0	0	17	16	0
Increased language preparation	6	10	0	0	0	12
Integration of courses	6	0	20	0	6	6
Cu[illegible]ular concentration on host country	6	0	10	17	6	6
Lighter student load on units	4	10	0	0	6	12
Faculty living separate	4	6	0	0	10	12
Greater choice of courses	3	6	0	17	0	0
Travel guidance	3	6	0	0	0	6
Explicit purpose	3	0	10	0	6	0
Connection with local university	3	0	10	0	6	0
More local teaching	3	0	10	0	6	0
More sophomores	3	0	10	17	0	0
Better research facilities	3	0	0	17	6	0
Better local civilization	3	0	0	17	0	6
Teach art regularly	3	0	0	0	22	0

Others mentioned:

More faculty
More money for program
Student living with families
Permanent faculty appointments
Academic council control
Screen courses
Courses conducted in language
Better local administration
Home-local language department contact
More activities for students
Shorter stay for faculty–one quarter
Wider faculty participation in planning

Appendix 4 Student Questionnaire Findings

During autumn and winter quarters 1967-68, student groups about to leave for each of the five overseas campuses were questioned on a variety of issues pertaining to their decision to study abroad. Of the total of 408 students in the five groups, 330 (81 percent) returned questionnaires, which were administered during orientation meetings. The 330 students were distributed as follows: Germany, 59; Austria, 79; Britain, 61; Italy, 66; France, 65. Throughout this report, the individual campus results are reported under the first initial for each campus: G, A, B, I, F, for Germany, Austria, Britain, Italy, and France, respectively.

The results appear in the format of the questionnaire. After each question, the results are listed *in percentage figures* for an all-campus average ("total") and separately for each campus. Open-ended questions have been coded into relevant categories; percentage figures in these areas, because of multiple responses, total more than 100 percent.

		Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
1. *Sex*	M	62	60	61	61	64	61
	F	38	40	39	39	36	39
2. *Age*	17	0	2	0	0	0	0
	18	7	10	5	6	5	6
	19	52	61	53	51	46	59
	20	29	22	32	28	34	29
	21	10	5	10	13	9	6
	22	2	0	0	2	6	0
3. *Class*	Freshman	1	0	3	0	0	0
	Sophomore	70	76	78	56	71	75
	Junior	23	20	15	34	20	22
	Senior	6	4	4	10	10	3
4. *Honors program*		10	14	7	3	11	17
5. *Been to Europe before?*							
	Yes, once	23	15	19	34	21	23
	Yes, 2 or more times	6	0	10	5	8	5
	No	71	85	71	61	71	72

6. *What do you hope to gain by going to an overseas campus that you would not be likely to get if you spent the same two quarters at Stanford in Palo Alto?*

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
A. Travel, general experience						
a. Good opportunity to travel, desire to travel, see the sights	26	47	20	56	12	6
b. Desire to live in Europe, study overseas, be in Europe as a student	15	10	16	18	21	9
c. Learn about other cultures, meet foreigners	28	25	35	8	36	34
d. Gain perspective on world problems, on U.S., have new experiences	9	5	14	7	11	11
e. Interest in particular culture	5	0	1	3	14	6
f. Learn or gain fluency in language	10	2	12	0	5	31
B. Stanford or academically related						
a. Incorporate the overseas experience into Stanford years, go overseas and not lose credit, see Europe without losing school time	7	5	5	8	8	12
b. Get away from campus, break from Stanford, desire for a change	10	5	8	13	20	6
c. Less academic pressure	19	20	22	5	17	31
d. Like Stanford set-up	10	12	12	13	9	8
e. Get to know Stanford students, small group living	11	7	14	5	9	17
f. Coed living	14	25	16	3	15	11
g. Educational opportunities, good professors going, broader curriculum	2	3	3	3	0	0
C. Personal						
a. Inexpensive	7	5	7	8	3	12
b. Revisit Europe	4	2	4	5	0	9
c. Parental pressure	4	2	3	2	9	6
d. Heard good reports from friends	4	5	5	5	3	5
e. Friends going, the thing to do	7	10	10	3	6	9
f. Maturity, perspective on life's goals	8	14	11	0	6	8
g. Fun, sports, interest in racing	2	3	0	2	3	0

7. *Which campus first choice?*

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Germany	28	98	22	12	5	3
Austria	12	0	54	0	0	6
Britain	16	0	7	65	5	0
Italy	19	0	5	3	81	3
France	25	2	6	20	9	88

8. *How important were the following in making decision? (Percentage figures represent the total of those students rating the respective considerations as "fairly important" or "very important.")*

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Language	58	73	58	41	41	85
Culture	71	64	62	82	77	74
Travel	81	86	74	87	79	82
Student group living	37	39	28	43	33	43
Professors going	13	15	8	10	20	12
Courses offered	15	19	11	15	14	17
Location of campus	57	64	68	35	67	49
Get to know professors	32	46	23	26	39	26
Professors get to know you	25	29	18	28	32	22
Winter sports	7	14	6	8	3	3
Contact with people of country	76	80	69	82	70	86

9. *How important to you are the following? (Percentage figures represent the total of those students rating the respective considerations as "fairly important" or "very important.")*

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Getting to know: European students	77	75	78	72	76	84
public figures	24	22	19	26	21	26
ordinary European families	81	90	73	79	85	83
socially important European families	10	9	10	13	9	6

10. *What courses have you taken for the purpose of helping you prepare yourself for going to an overseas campus? ("General" means not limited to one country.)*

Of all students:
13% took a general music course
24% took a general art course
13% took a general history course
12% took a specific language course
56% took two or more specific language courses

The following percentage figures represent the fraction of students at each campus who took *no* course in the listed fields:

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Music	83	81	81	85	85	85
Art	69	76	69	80	49	69
Literature	85	92	84	84	85	85
Language	24	9	16	74	5	14
History	75	75	72	79	82	72
Political Science	87	92	87	82	88	89

11. *How often do you engage in the following activities? (Percentage figures represent the total of those students who answered "frequently" to the respective category of activity.)*

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Listen to classical music	30	7	35	7	42	46
Read books not required for classes	44	34	50	48	53	37
Attend outside lectures on campus	33	17	41	30	35	39
Attend theater	22	3	27	3	42	26
Attend or participate in political demonstrations or rallies	17	25	14	30	12	12
Participate in intramural sports	18	2	30	5	26	23
Participate in other forms of extracurricular activities	53	44	58	36	59	63

12. *Was the Overseas Campus Program an important factor in your decision to come to Stanford?*

	Total	*G*	*A*	*B*	*I*	*F*
Yes	42	15	55	20	61	58
No	47	53	45	56	38	42
No answer	11	32	0	24	1	0

Appendix 5 The Special Programs

Stanford German Program in Hamburg

Nature and Purpose. The Hamburg program offers an opportunity for junior, senior, and graduate German and history majors to develop language proficiency and pursue special fields of interest while enrolled in a German university. It provides close contact with German students and active participation in the cultural life of Hamburg. The location at Hamburg, the largest city in West Germany, provides a rich cultural atmosphere and a high quality of spoken language. Students are housed either in university residences or in private homes.

Administration. The Hamburg program is jointly administered by the German Department, which determines all academic and selection policy, living arrangements, and so forth, and the Stanford Overseas Campus Office, which has responsibility for travel to Europe and other matters. Local administration is in the hands of a Resident Lecturer and Administrator and another Stanford faculty member. Most of the work with the University of Hamburg, all of the living arrangements, and the extracurricular plans are handled by the Resident Lecturer.

Funding. During the first three years of operation, the program was supported by the Ford Foundation. After the discontinuation of these funds, the Overseas Campus Office assumed financial responsibility. It now operates primarily on regular tuition, room, and board fees (which include the eastbound flight over), supplemented by a German government grant, which covers approximately 12.5 percent of the operating expenses.

Faculty. The Resident Lecturer and Administrator is in residence at the Palo Alto campus each autumn and at Hamburg each spring and summer. In addition, one member of the German faculty accompanies the group and is in residence overseas.

Students. Juniors, seniors, and graduate students (declared German or history majors before departure) who have at least a B average in German are eligible. Students who have been to one of the overseas campuses may apply. There are specified minimum linguistic requirements for applying, which include grammar, conversation, composition, and some German literature courses. Participation in the program has varied as follows:

1962:	10	8 undergraduates, 2 graduates
1963:	10	8 undergraduates, 2 graduates
1964:	9	8 undergraduates, 1 graduate
1965:	11	9 undergraduates, 2 graduates
1966:	13	8 undergraduates, 5 graduates
1967:	15	8 undergraduates, 1 graduate in German
		5 undergraduates, 1 graduate in History
1968:	18	12 undergraduates, 5 graduates in German
		1 undergraduate in History

Curriculum. The students arrive in early April and until the beginning of classes at the University of Hamburg in mid-April take classes in composition and literature from the Resident Lecturer and other faculty member. During the spring quarter they receive credit as follows: 2 units, composition; 2 units, phonetics; 4 units, literature; 2 units, theater; 4 units, independent work (the early portion of the

Hamburg term). During the summer the literature course is dropped and students continue with selected courses at the University of Hamburg in which they have to pass examinations administered by the professors of the University of Hamburg. Credit during summer quarter is as follows: 2 units, composition; 2 units, theater; 2 units, phonetics; 8 units, independent work (courses at the University). Thus the students, while both enrolled at the University of Hamburg in electives and taking special courses as a group, receive 14 units credit per quarter during their stay.

Extra-curriculum. A great deal of emphasis is put on out-of-class activities. Frequent field trips are made. The students are exposed to the cultural offerings of Hamburg. Theater trips, for example, are part of the two-unit course in German drama. A new Stanford center, opened this year near the University, serves as a focal point for social activity.

Evaluation. Participating students and faculty consider the Hamburg program a success. The program seems to have achieved an excellent balance: structured enough to keep students from feeling lost in a completely new academic environment, yet not so structured as to stifle individual interest and specialized academic pursuits. Most students, particularly those who lived in student dormitories, were pleased with their contacts with German students, and many were able to participate actively in student-initiated political forums and residential seminars. Their linguistic proficiency and fluency substantially increased. Their active participation in many aspects of Hamburg life was of great benefit, as evaluated by the faculty concerned and the students themselves.

The success of this program is evident in its consistently increasing enrollment: 24 students applied for admission in 1968, from which 18 were chosen. The inclusion of history majors with a special interest in Germany increased student interest in the program, and the German Department will continue to encourage interdisciplinary participation and extend it to other disciplines besides history. In addition to a much-acclaimed academic and residential situation, there is great satisfaction with the extra-curricular aspects of the program.

Stanford French Program in Tours

Nature and Purpose. This program is designed for junior and senior French majors and graduate students. Its purpose is to involve those participating as thoroughly as possible in French life and culture while permitting them to continue their studies for two quarters (autumn and winter) without any loss of time or credits. Under the guidance of a member of the Stanford French faculty, the students are enrolled in French courses at the Faculté des Lettres of the University of Tours.

The program was originally located in Nantes, which was chosen primarily because of the encouragement of the faculty and administration there. (Location in Paris is not feasible because of tremendous student overcrowding.) The program began in 1964, when it sent four groups of between 11 and 13 students, who were housed in the Cité Universitaire. The Nantes location eventually proved inadequate. There was dissatisfaction with the quality of instruction at the University. Nantes is a young school and has not yet been able to attract top scholars. In addition, students thought that Nantes was a relatively dull city, and that the four-and-a-half hour trip to Paris was too long.

The University of Tours, with its excellent Faculté des Lettres, was chosen as the provisional new location, and six Stanford students have been in residence at Tours since September 1968.

Administration. The Tours program is jointly administered by the French Department—which determines all academic and selection policy, living arrangements, and so forth—and the Stanford Overseas Campus Office, which has responsibility for travel to Europe and other matters. Local direction is given by a member of the Stanford faculty.

Funding. There is no outside funding, and the program operates on regular tuition, room, and board fees. This regular fee from the student includes one-way fare to France, similar to the overseas campus program. Financial aid is available for the cost of the return flight.

Faculty. One professor from the French Department accompanies the students each term (two quarters).

Students. Juniors, seniors, and graduate students who have or will have declared a major in French by the time of attendance are eligible for the program. Graduate students cannot participate until their third year. Students who have been to one of the overseas campuses may apply. The minimum linguistic requirement for applying is French 54 (by the time of departure). Participation in the program has varied as follows:

1964–65	11 undergraduates
1965–66	11 undergraduates, 1 graduate
1966–67	11 undergraduates, 1 graduate
1967–68	13 undergraduates
1968–69	6 undergraduates

Curriculum. The participating Stanford professor offers courses in French composition, grammar, and sometimes a senior colloquium. The students are also enrolled in courses in French literature at the University of Tours. The average number of units taken by the undergraduates varies from 15 to 17 per quarter, a unit evaluation determined on examination of the courses by the Stanford professor.

Extra-curriculum. In the past excursions to places such as Paris, the Riviera, and the chateaux of the Loire Valley have been organized. There are two or three such field trips per quarter.

Evaluation. Many students have found the program a rewarding part of their academic careers. Faculty state that the improvement in conversational ability is dramatic and, by itself, justifies the program. Serious problems have beset the program, however.

It is not clear that the move to Tours will alleviate the central problem–a waning interest on the part of students and a concomitant decline in enrollment. The new location seems to offer greatly improved academic resources, and the distance from Paris is half of what it is from Nantes. But many of the criticisms that were heard from students–the weather, the inhospitality of the French, and so forth–are not going to be changed.

Stanford Spanish Program in Salamanca

Nature and Purpose. Salamanca has been chosen as the provisional site for the Stanford Spanish Program, after political problems at the University of Madrid forced the abandonment of original plans to locate there. The program is designed for juniors, seniors, and graduate students who are majoring in Spanish, Latin American Studies, or allied disciplines. It is jointly operated by the Stanford Overseas Campus Office and the Department of Spanish and Portuguese. Its purpose is to involve participating students as thoroughly as possible in Spanish life and culture, while permitting

them to continue their studies for two academic quarters with normal progress toward their degrees. Under the guidance of an accompanying member of the Stanford faculty, the students are enrolled in courses at the University of Salamanca. The Stanford Professor in Residence offers additional courses in Spanish as needed and evaluates the work done by each student at the University of Salamanca. Undergraduates take 15 units per quarter. Graduate programs are arranged individually. Educational field trips, scheduled for graduates and undergraduates together, are an integral and required part of the program. Graduate students pursue their programs under the guidance and supervision of the Professor in Residence.

The University of Salamanca was founded in 1218 and is thus the oldest university in Spain and one of the oldest in the world. It has an international reputation for academic excellence. Its schools include Law, Medicine, Science, and Philosophy and Letters; most of the courses taken by Stanford students are in the School of Philosophy and Letters.

The old city of Salamanca is the capital of the province of the same name and is famous in literature and history. It is about 150 miles northwest of Madrid in the heart of Old Castile. All students in the program are housed in the Colegio Mayor "Gran Via," together with university students from Spain and elsewhere.

Administration. The program is jointly administered by the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, which determines all academic and selection policy, living arrangements, and so forth, and the Stanford Overseas Campus Office, which has responsibility for travel to Europe and other matters. Local direction is given by a member of the Stanford faculty.

Funding. There is no outside funding, and the program operates on regular tuition, room, and board fees. The student fee includes one-way fare to Spain, similar to the overseas campus program. Financial aid is available for the cost of the return flight.

Faculty. Dr. Bernard Gicovate, Executive Head of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, accompanied the first group to Salamanca.

Students. Spanish majors and one history major are participating the first year. They include 12 undergraduates and one graduate student. Students who have been to one of the overseas campuses may apply. The minimum linguistic requirement is two years of college Spanish.

Curriculum. Students audit courses at the University of Salamanca while taking a course in Spanish composition and conversation with the resident director. They write reports in Spanish on their work in two courses at the University and on books they read for each of the two courses. In addition, students submit a paper for each of the two courses in the winter quarter. Grades are given by the director on the basis of these reports and oral work for a total of 15 units per quarter, which can be counted toward the undergraduate major in Spanish.

Evaluation. The location at Salamanca is a provisional one and involves no long-term commitments extending beyond this year's two-quarter program. Other locations for a Spanish language program are under consideration, and the Salamanca venture should not in any way prejudice the development of a program or programs in Latin America for students of Latin American Studies (at either undergraduate or graduate levels or both), for language, social sciences, or other studies.

Inter-University Center for Japanese Studies in Tokyo and the Inter-University Center for Chinese Studies in Taipei

Nature and Purposes of the Centers. The Tokyo center offers full-time instruction in Japanese for qualified graduate and undergraduate students. Its location in Tokyo provides favorable conditions for advanced intensive study of the Japanese language, in a Japanese linguistic and cultural environment. It provides opportunities for individual work dependent on the student's linguistic qualifications and his degree program as established by his home institution. The program began in April 1961 as an area center accepting both undergraduates and graduates, administered solely by Stanford. This original program ran into serious difficulties because of differences in competence among its students. In February 1964, the center became a language training program and was converted to an inter-university program—a cooperative effort of several sponsoring institutions. The center was located on the campus of International Christian University, Tokyo, until August 3, 1967, when it was relocated in the heart of Tokyo.

The Taipei center offers undergraduate students intensive language instruction and furthers their familiarity with Chinese as preparation for research in professional fields. The center began operation on September 1, 1962, as a language training program. One year later the program merged with the disbanding Cornell program (which was losing Ford Foundation funds until the merger) and was converted to the Inter-University Program for Chinese Studies—a cooperative effort with ten sponsoring institutions. The center is located in its own building on the campus of National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan.

Administration. The centers are administered by Stanford on behalf of the Inter-University Board for Chinese Language Studies in Taipei and the Inter-University Committee for Japanese Language Studies in Tokyo. These inter-university groups meet annually to formulate policy, to approve the appointment of the director, to appoint committees on admissions and awards, and to conduct any other business, such as studying curriculum relationships with the host governments. At Stanford, responsibility for the centers lies with the Center for Research on International Studies, and specifically with Professor Carl Spaeth, Chairman of the Committee on International Studies. Neither center is administered by local groups. A faculty member from one of the participating institutions acts as director. He is responsible to Stanford University for all matters pertaining to administration and to the governing organization on all matters of policy or curriculum. Eleven institutions participate in the Tokyo center, nine in the Taipei center.

Funding. The earlier Stanford Japanese center was supported by contributions from the Thomas E. Gore Fund, a Carnegie Foundation grant, and tuition, and room and board payments from students. The Inter-University Center is supported by a Ford Foundation grant, Carnegie Foundation grants, and fees from students.

The earlier Stanford center at Taipei was supported by grants from the Asia Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, the Thomas E. Gore Fund, and tuition and room and board fees from students. The present inter-university program is supported by a Ford Foundation grant, a Carnegie Corporation grant, and fees from students. Stanford's only financial commitment to the centers is the time spent by Professor Spaeth and Eleanor Lane of the Graduate Overseas Programs Office.

Students. In one session the Tokyo center has accommodated between 1 and 22 undergraduates and between 12 and 15 graduates. Of these, between 1 and 14 were Stanford undergraduates, and between 1 and 13 were Stanford graduate students.

Between 1 and 11 undergraduates with 13 to 34 graduates have attended sessions at the Taipei center. Of these, between 2 and 7 Stanford graduates have participated in any one session. No Stanford undergraduates have attended.

Curriculum. Courses are in Japanese and Chinese. In addition, in Taipei courses are offered in Taiwanese, Mongolian, Cantonese, and other Chinese dialects, as well as in Mandarin. Classes at Taipei are tutorial; classes at Tokyo are small group or tutorial. Students at the Tokyo center with adequate language competence are tutees of a member of a Japanese university during the second half of the year. This instruction is usually in specialized work and is coordinated with the director at the center. Students at the Taipei center with sufficient competence in the spoken language may add other courses in place of conversation classes or may audit appropriate courses in National Taiwan University.

Academic Calendar. The academic calendar in both centers corresponds to the Stanford calendar. Students are expected, however, to remain for four quarters, including the summer quarter following the academic year. The program begins in September of each year.

Methods of Selection. Students apply for admission through the Graduate Overseas Special Programs Office at Stanford. Applicants must have at least two years of the language, be degree candidates in good standing, and take a screening examination.

For Tokyo, the Inter-University Committee appoints a Committee on Selections and Awards; for Taipei, the Inter-University Board appoints a Committee on Admissions and Awards. Each applicant is carefully evaluated on the basis of his academic record, his references, his statement of purpose, and the results of the screening examination. The inter-university committees meet in May of each year to evaluate applicants to both programs. Usually the committee is chaired by one university, with members of the committee chosen from the faculty of that university. The ex-chairman of the committee for the previous year also serves. Whenever possible, the incoming director is asked to serve on the Admissions Committee.

Intercollegiate Center for Classical Studies in Rome

Nature and Purpose. The Rome center is designed to promote study of Greek and Latin and classical cultures among American and Canadian undergraduates.

The center started in 1963 with a meeting of ten American universities and colleges at the annual convention of the American Philological and Archaeological Associations. It was then agreed that finances should be sought for a center to be located in Rome. A managing committee was set up to achieve these purposes and inaugurate the center. Funds for establishing the center were secured from the Danforth and Old Dominion Foundations. Stanford University (through the Overseas Campus Office) agreed to act as the center's operating agent under the general direction of a Managing Committee. A villa in Rome was then leased, a first faculty and a resident administrative director were appointed, and the first group of 30 students was accepted.

The center actually started operating in February 1966. By that time, 16 universities and colleges had become members. There are currently 34 participating institutions. The Center is located on the Janiculum in Rome, close to the American Academy. It is on the main bus lines and is within easy reach of central Rome (about ten minutes by bus from Piazza Venezia). The villa occupied by the center belongs to the Sisters of the Sacre Coeur and contains private rooms for 30 students, classrooms, a library, and dining and recreation rooms.

Administration. The center is administered for the constituent universities and colleges by Stanford University. Stanford appoints the Director of Administration and is responsible for all financial and domestic arrangements, including the care and supervision of students. Dr. Giancarlo Galassi Beria is the Director of Administration in Rome. Students must conform to such regulations as are deemed necessary by the Stanford Overseas Campuses Office. General academic direction of the center is vested in the five-member Managing Committee elected by the constituent members. A special Selection and Scholarships Committee is in charge of admissions and scholarship aid from foundation funds.

Funding. The center is funded from grants from the Danforth Foundation ($10,000 for library acquisition) and the Old Dominion Foundation ($25,000 per year for approximately three years, plus $35,000 maximum per year for scholarships). In addition, faculty are provided by participating institutions on a rotating basis. Normal tuition, room and board fees are charged.

Academic Calendar. There are two terms, September to January and February to June. Instruction, educational field trips, vacations, and examinations are scheduled so that each term students complete the equivalent of two academic quarters of work.

Faculty. The faculty is chosen from the classics departments of participating institutions.

Students. Admission is limited to undergraduates at the constituent institutions of the center. Applicants must: major in classics (Greek, Latin, or both); have had at least four semesters or six quarters of college-level Latin or the equivalent; have had at least one semester or two quarters of Greek (the Selection Committee makes certain exceptions); have a general average of at least B. In a few cases graduate students are accepted as teaching assistants or as special students at the center. Attendance has varied from 23 to 30, of which 1 to 9 have been Stanford students.

Stanford-Warsaw Exchange Program

This program provides an opportunity for selected graduate students to benefit educationally, culturally, and linguistically from study and research in Poland. The only American-Polish exchange program it provides up to 11 months of independent research in Poland to graduate students at the dissertation level. It is open to students in the humanities and social sciences from Stanford, the University of California at Berkeley, and the University of California at Los Angeles and has had students in history, political science, law, mathematics, language, and literature in past years. It is administered by the Stanford Center for Research in International Studies, which handles selection and negotiation of contracts and helps with transportation to and from Warsaw.

Until last year the program was totally supported by Public Law 480 funds through the Department of State. Since the fall of 1967, the program has been supported almost entirely through the Overseas Projects in Education (Office of Education National Defense Foreign Language Fellowship Program), also using Public Law 480 funds. Travel is provided by the United States government and is paid for in Polish zlotys in Poland. Students also receive a travel allowance for travel within Poland.

Students are selected by a committee of administrators who judge the applicants on the basis of academic standing, references, statement of purpose, and personal interview. All students must also be acceptable to the Department of State, the Office of Education, and the University of Warsaw. No academic credit is given for the year, and Stanford students are registered in terminal graduate status.

Most participating students are gathering data for their dissertations. A brief orientation program is given by former participants in the quarter before departure. No Stanford faculty member is involved overseas on a regular basis, and students have a faculty adviser at the University of Warsaw. Living arrangements are made for each group by a designated member of the previous group. All students must attend an orientation session on arrival in Poland and must enroll in an intensive course in Polish. This course begins on August 1 (on arrival) and continues for a period of two months. Students' curricula vary from full-time course work to full-time supervised independent work. Attendance has varied from three to six students, including from two to five Stanford students.

This program also enables three Polish graduate students to receive support from Department of State funds for an academic year at Stanford. The Department of State provides for round-trip travel and a baggage allowance. Cost-of-living stipends, fees, and incidental travel costs are provided by Stanford University through grants from the Kosciuszko Foundation, the San Francisco Foundation, the Wanda Roehr Foundation, and the Alfred Jurzykowski Foundation.